


Heritage and Destiny



£3.00 / \$6.00 Issue 36

Stand Men of the West - Today is the day we fight!

April - June 2009



Europe 2009

The Smokescreen of Deceit (see page 14)
Plus Euro-election preview (see page 2)



also in this issue:
How Relevant
is Holocaust
Revisionism?
see page 10

and *Valkyrie* the movie:
reviewed on page 24





Editor: Mark Cotterill: Assistant Editors: Martin Kerr and Peter Rushton

Webmaster: Carl Clifford: Sales Manager: Anne Wright

UK address: BCM Box 7318, London, WC1N 3XX, Great Britain

U.S. address: P. O. Box 6501, Falls Church, Virginia 22046, USA

Tel: (44) 07833 677484: Website: www.efp.org.uk

ISSN 1741-8941: Electronic Mail: heritageanddestiny@yahoo.com

Opinions expressed in articles are the authors' own, and should not be taken to represent *H&D*s viewpoint



Editorial

Welcome to Issue 36 of *Heritage and Destiny*. We make no apologies for devoting so much of this issue to Europe - including Ron Rickcord's excellent article - *England & Europe: The Smokescreen of Deceit A discussion of the EU's usurpation of our national independence* (pages 14-19) - and this extended editorial - mainly written by our assistant editor Peter Rushton. Of course before our next issue (no.37) hits the streets, the future of the nationalist movement in general and the BNP in particular will be known. The future of "White Britain" and English survival may have been settled for decades, if not for ever, who knows? It could all boil down to how we vote - if we vote at all - on June 4th. OK over to you Peter:

Euro 2009 - is this Griffin's moment?

Elections to the European Parliament will be held across all 27 EU states in the first week of June 2009. In the UK the British National Party will invest almost all of its remaining funds in a bid to elect Nick Griffin, who will be the party's main candidate in North West England, despite never having lived, worked or held elected office in the region.

Griffin is targeting the North West because of the unusual arithmetic involved in the electoral system for the Euro-elections. Depending on how other smaller parties perform, a seat can be won here with 8-9% of the vote, which the BNP believes feasible, while in their wildest dreams some party officials imagine that they can achieve 15%, which would see both Griffin and Martin Wingfield, number two on the BNP's regional slate, elected.

Readers should bear in mind that this target means a 9% average across the entire region, from the multiracial slums of Liverpool Toxteth to the affluent commuter belt of Cheshire; from the Welsh border to the Scottish border; from the former mill towns of Central Lancashire to the tourist paradise of the Lake District. The BNP's only councillors across this region are in Burnley and nearby Pendle. Formerly strong branches in Oldham and



Blackburn have virtually collapsed. On the positive side the region also contains Cumbria, which is one of the most active BNP branches though it hasn't yet won an election. Manchester, Salford, Rossendale and Tameside branches have all shown themselves capable of fighting election campaigns.

In 2004 the slate (headed again by Nick Griffin) polled 6.4%, so a considerable improvement is necessary. While the UKIP vote is sure to decline substantially from 2004's 11.7%, many of these voters will return to the Conservatives or opt for the resurgent English Democrats, who are expected to organise a serious campaign this year.

The weakness of the BNP across most of the North West is well illustrated by the composition of its 2009 slate. There are no candidates from Lancashire or Cheshire, and none of the candidates has ever won any election.

The BNP's profile in the region was created by electoral success in South East Lancashire's former mill towns between 2001 and 2004, but there is no candidate on the list from Burnley, Blackburn, Oldham or Pendle.

Heading the slate is Nick Griffin, a former bankrupt from East Anglia who now lives in Wales and has no connections whatever with North West England. Second is the Cumbria based Martin Wingfield - like Griffin a former National Front chairman and born in southern England. Another Cumbria branch activist is at number six on the slate. There are three candidates from Greater Manchester, and two from Merseyside.

Another potential target area for the BNP is the East Midlands, where in complete contrast to the North West the slate is composed entirely of elected councillors, headed by the eccentric preacher the Rev. Robert West. Number two is Charnwood councillor Cathy Duffy. Since the East Midlands only elects five MEPs as against the North West's eight the BNP will need a much higher percentage to gain a seat - more like 13% - but recent council successes will give them some hope of eating into UKIP's 2004 vote which was a massive 26.1%, boosted by their short-lived alliance with Robert Kilroy-Silk.

The West Midlands slate is headed by Griffin's deputy Simon Darby, who like his chief now lives in Wales. At least this slate does include an elected councillor at number two - Alby Walker, who leads the BNP group on

continued on page 9

Heritage and Destiny

Heritage and Destiny reflects a cross-section of 21st century racial nationalist opinion. It is independent of all political organisations and parties. Unless stated otherwise, views expressed in signed articles or letters in *Heritage and Destiny* are the sole responsibility of the writers concerned and do not necessarily reflect the views of the editor or other staff.

We welcome enquiries from prospective advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. However the editor reserves the right to refuse to publish any advertisement submitted, without giving reasons. The appearance of any advertisement in *Heritage and Destiny* does not necessarily indicate that the editor knows anything about, endorses or is interested in the product, organisation, event or service being advertised.

Contributors and advertisers should bear in mind that *Heritage and Destiny* is subject to the laws of the United Kingdom, including our infamous race laws. Refusal to publish certain items should therefore not be taken as a personal or political affront!

The editor is pleased to receive articles for possible publication, preferably by disk or email. No payment is made for articles. Unless the writer specifically requests otherwise, articles become *Heritage and Destiny* copyright. The editor reserves the right to shorten or otherwise amend articles submitted for publication. Those wishing to republish *Heritage and Destiny* items in other formats should be sure when doing so to give public acknowledgment to both the writer and *Heritage and Destiny* and to include in the acknowledgment the magazine's full address.

40 Years of the National Front - Part VII

For a brief period in the late 1980s quasi-theological notions, and even explicitly religious issues, came to the forefront of the National Front's internal divisions.

Successive defeats in 1979 and 1983 and the departure or ousting of the movement's old guard leaders John Tyndall, Andrew Fountaine and Martin Webster, had left the Front's new collective leadership, mostly under 30, seeking inspiration after (as they believed) having dispelled the shadow of Monday Club style Tory reaction, vague yearning for Mosley-style leadership, and semi-mystical Hitlerism.

Though he had been outside the NF for several years after aligning himself with the National Party split (and later with the League of St George) Steve Brady soon became a leading advocate for a faction in the party leadership that distrusted exotic continental ideologies. In a letter to the jailed nationalist journalist Joe Pearce, Brady outlined what he saw as the NF's mid-1980s position and how he envisaged a path to future progress:

Our first priority for many years was to equip the Party with a valid radical nationalist political and ideological platform, a 'Vision for Britain' and a comprehensive programme for national rebirth, in place of a penumbra of reactionary Toryism around a central shadow of Hitlerite cultism and veneration of tyranny, past and hoped-for future. This has now been achieved. Our energies should now be channelled into publicising that programme and exploiting the vast reservoir of potential support that is out there waiting for us, not vanishing up our own ideological nether orifices in an orgy of obscurantist irrelevance and esoteric jargon or indulging romantic adolescent 'revolutionary' fantasies.

Brady's provocative language was aimed primarily at Cambridge graduate Nick Griffin and Derek Holland, a Catholic and former member of the Trotskyite Workers Revolutionary Party who had become the ideological guru of the NF's self-described "radicals". Together with the Italian fugitives Roberto Fiore and Massimo Morsello, Holland introduced the ideas of the Romanian fascist leader Corneliu Codreanu to provide a core philosophy for the party.

Codreanu was the founder and leader of the Iron Guard (also known as the Legion of the Archangel Michael), a paramilitary party

which sought to align Romania with National Socialist Germany. At first outmanoeuvred by rival nationalist leaders, Codreanu was imprisoned and murdered in November 1938, but his "Legion" took power in the autumn of 1940. With typical delusions of grandeur, Nick Griffin identified with the Iron Guard's struggle for a pure form of fascism, which ended in January 1941 when the movement was brutally ousted from power by Romania's military leader Gen. Ion Antonescu.

Griffin and his cronies sympathised with Codreanu's critique of democracy: *Democracy destroys the unity of the Romanian nation, dividing it among political parties, making Romanians hate one another, and thus exposing a divided people to the united congregation of Jewish power at a difficult time in the nation's history. ... Democracy serves big business. Because of the expensive, competitive character of the multiparty system, democracy requires ample funds. It therefore naturally becomes the servant of the big international Jewish financiers, who enslave her by paying her.*

Few readers would doubt that Codreanu had a point here, and Griffin's 21st century associates in the BNP might wish he still followed some of his Romanian hero's prescriptions: *[Most important of all is the spiritual patrimony, because it alone bears the seal of eternity, it alone transcends all times. The ancient Greeks are with us today not because of their physiques, no matter how athletic - those are only ashes now - nor because of their material wealth, if they had such, but because of their culture. A nation lives forever through its concepts, honour, and culture. It is for these reasons that the rulers of nations must judge and act not only on the basis of physical and material interests of the nation but on the basis of the nation's historical honour, of the nation's eternal interests. Thus: not bread at all costs, but honour at all costs.*


Brady however argued that (especially with Britain in the grip of recession) the National Front should be targeting its propaganda at more material concerns. In his letter to Pearce he denounced Griffin's *Nationalism Today* as having been *-justifiably described of late as "an obscurantist house journal" and "the self-indulgent in-talk of an isolated little clique".*

...The apotheosis of all this, and the point at which it virtually attains self-parody, is the absurd cult of the obscure Romanian clerico-fascist Codreanu, and of his equally obscure Iron Guard, a body which was barely more relevant to his own country and his own era than it is to ours. ...even were he relevant, as at least Hitler for all his faults was, [Codreanu] would be a massive liability. For in fact this "Spiritual Leader" was a psychopathic nutcase and a political failure, as well as being in my opinion a crank. ...Even our members, most of whom have never heard of Romania let alone Codreanu, find the whole thing arcane and baffling in the extreme. Let alone the general public (whose existence I suspect some of our Leading Thinkers have long since forgotten). At this rate the NF won't get itself banned. It'll get itself certified!

Brady continued to explain to Pearce the approach which was soon to be labelled by the Griffin clique as "reactionary populism" (presumably as opposed to their own unpopular radicalism).

This Codreanu thing exemplifies the attitude of our current leadership, most of which is composed of "professional Nationalists" who live in a little world composed of others like them, as remote from the general public as the backside of Uranus. The frustrating thing is that if you actually do talk to the public you find that there is far more potential support out there for us than our leadership seems to realise, and to a large extent we are alienating that support ourselves. What we need now is to make our propaganda more relevant, not less, to get out among the people, instead of retreating into an isolationist clique, a tendency promoted during the Webster Era and now endemic. In fact, not only are the members allowed to isolate themselves from the public, but the leadership seems determined to isolate itself from the members. There is a widespread and growing feeling that the Party is run by a little clique, few of them elected by the members or, in many cases, ever seen by them on activities, and spending its time arguing incomprehensibly about irrelevancies, and that people are "in" or "out" with that clique, and secure their positions in the Party accordingly.

The logic of Brady's position was that the NF should return to fighting elections, a position disdained by Griffin and his radical faction in favour of building a vanguard of national revolutionary cadres.



Rival contenders as ideological influences on the NF - Nick Griffin opted for Rumanian fascist leader Corneliu Codreanu (left); others preferred native English traditions represented by G.K. Chesterton (above right) and J.R.R. Tolkien (below right).



NF Directorate members marching in temporary unity but soon to split (left to right): Tom Mundy, Joe Pearce and Ian Anderson took one side, Nick Griffin and Patrick Harrington the other. The factions finally parted in the summer of 1986.

Brady maintained that regardless of whether the party was yet in a position to win elections:

apart from being an activity which forces members to talk to people elections also act as an indicator of our progress - all the waffle in the world about "building the national revolution" cannot substitute for a steady rise in our percentage poll as proof of progress.

Yet the mid-1980s remained a barren electoral period for the NF. In June 1984, just after the final ousting of Martin Webster and while the new rivals were temporarily united, the party managed to field a candidate in Portsmouth South, but Ginger Knight polled only 226 votes (0.5%). To make matters worse in Portsmouth and elsewhere, the Social Democratic Party and its Liberal allies were garnering many of the protest votes which had once gone to the Front, which was thus failing to benefit from the fading appeal of Margaret Thatcher's Conservatives.

By now even NF candidates for local councils were becoming a rarity. In July 1984 the party polled 4.3% in St Peter's ward, Tower Hamlets, where the party had taken 19% in 1978.

When an IRA bomb murdered the Conservative MP Sir Anthony Berry at the party's Brighton conference, the NF was unable to field a candidate at the consequent Enfield Southgate by-election in December 1984. This proved the final electoral outing for the former Fountaine faction, renamed the Nationalist Party, whose candidate James Kershaw polled just 80 votes (0.2%). Early in 1985 the Nationalist Party folded. Andrew Fountaine himself stayed aloof from party politics until his death in 1997. Former lieutenant Bernard Franklin rejoined the NF after a few years absence, while most of the membership aligned themselves with John Tyndall's BNP.

As pressure built up towards the 1986 split the NF (as Brady noted) failed to contest the Fulham by-election in April. Veteran racial nationalist campaigner Lady Birdwood (who in a lifetime's activism never actually joined any of the many nationalist parties) picked up the challenge and stood as an independent candidate, finishing fourth out of eleven candidates with 226 votes (0.6%).

In May 1986 the NF fielded just one candidate at the Inner London Education Authority elections - the only London-wide election contest between 1981 and 2000. John Wright polled 1.6% in Vauxhall.

On the same day the Front's Roger Evans polled 9.7% in the borough elections for St Dunstan's ward, Tower Hamlets, and a few weeks later he took a respectable 5% in a local council by-election for Holy Trinity ward. This was the old East End heartland of Mosley's British Union where the Front had polled well in 1978 but was now fading fast. Later in 1986, as the NF crumbled, the Tower Hamlets branch defected to the BNP, which was to make history in the borough within a few years.

Griffin and the radical faction remained strong advocates of provocative street activity, never more so than in February 1986 when they urged physical confrontation with Irish republicans at the 'Bloody Sunday' commemoration march in North London. Deliberately sabotaging what he saw as a reckless and counterproductive tactic, Martin Wingfield overruled Griffin and negotiated with the police to hold a legal counter-demonstration behind barricades. To Griffin's disgust, Wingfield also sought to restrain the more hot-headed NF militants from hurling missiles at the police. Griffin was later to write (of the man who will again be presented to North West voters as his number two on this year's European election slate): *Wingfield's "Mr. Nice Guy" image conceals an arrogant self-importance and lust for power of shocking proportions.*

Many members were shocked when leading Griffin ally Phil Andrews, speaking at the NF's St George's Day demonstration in Stoke, said of the April 1984 murder of policewoman Yvonne Fletcher:

What's all this fuss about the police woman who was shot outside the Libyan embassy? We should not shed any tears over the death of an agent of the Thatcher regime.

Andrews is now a "Community Group" councillor in the London Borough of Hounslow.

The showdown occurred at a meeting of the NF Directorate in May 1986, the day after a march in memory of martyred activist Albert Mariner. Former party chairman Andrew Brons travelled down to London from his Yorkshire home and allied himself with Wingfield and Anderson against Griffin. The Directorate consisted of eighteen members and was thought to be under Wingfield's control, especially as the jailed Joe Pearce had given him his proxy vote, while Griffin could command the six-member Executive which was in day to day control of the party. A handful of non-Directorate members also attended the meeting, but waited outside during the proceedings. Griffin complained:

Everyone was surprised to see the well-known and widely disliked malicious gossip Steve Brady enter the building with Wingfield's group.

Brady had informed the Directorate of Griffin's plot to force Anderson's expulsion, and of his typical combination of threats and inducements to bring others into line with this purge. The Directorate demanded that Griffin produce evidence to back his series of charges against Anderson: typically Griffin was unable to provide it, and the case against Anderson was rejected by ten votes to eight. Charges against some of Anderson's East London allies were also thrown out.

In what seemed like a comprehensive victory over the Griffinites, the Directorate proceeded to elect a new Executive, on which Wingfield would expect to be backed by Brons, Pearce, Tom Acton and Paul Nash, leaving Griffin (though nominally vice-chairman) in a minority of one. In attempting to press home their advantage, however, the anti-Griffin forces lost the support of Michael Fishwick, who had taken over the running of the party's youth wing during Joe Pearce's imprisonment. Fishwick became a convert to Derek Holland's circle of traditionalist Catholics (and remains an active Catholic to this day). Like Holland he became for the time being an ally of Griffin's alongside other leading radicals such as Graham Williamson and Patrick Harrington.

Fishwick was able to inform the radical faction that the NF leadership was plotting to suspend Holland and Patrick Harrington. This early warning prompted Griffin (in true Third World military coup style) to seize the initiative. He ordered the NF's administrative files to be moved to a new location beyond the party leadership's reach, and had the locks changed at the party's HQ at Pawsons Road, Croydon.



NF Kent Regional Organiser Paul Johnson (left) with Ian Anderson - the NFs national activities organiser - on the infamous "Keep Maidstone White" march in 1984, remembered mainly for the violence of Red Action and the arrest of Mick Turner and his London drum corps (including Patrick Harrington) for wearing "political uniforms". Johnson's later suspension from the NF Directorate for "illegal activities" helped cost Anderson's faction control of the party.

The NF's factional strife now began to accelerate into farce, with the leadership obtaining court orders against Griffin and his allies, then on attempting to serve the orders being confronted by Griffin wielding a shotgun. The High Court agreed to delay any action until a further Directorate meeting could be held to determine who was really in charge of the National Front. (21st century BNP members will be amused to note the outrage of the 1986-vintage Nick Griffin at the idea that party headquarters "could have seized the accounts of local units, as well as the Party's national operations.")

Increasingly bemused NF members were deluged by a series of bulletins from the rival factions making allegations and counter-allegations, culminating in a Directorate meeting at which Griffin and his allies regained control. It is interesting to note that of Griffin's eight allies at that meeting only one is still a Griffinite (Mick Turner, now a BNP activist in Brixham, Devon, and absentee Griffinite organiser in Exeter). Griffin's key rivals (including former party chairmen Brons, Anderson and Wingfield) were expelled. A new executive was installed with Griffin in the chair, and with a characteristic touch of malice Steve Brady was accused of leaking information to *Searchlight*.

The expelled former leaders and their supporters organised themselves as the National Front Support Group and started two new publications: a newspaper *The Flag* and a magazine *Vanguard*. So in effect there were now two National Fronts as Thatcherism neared the end of its second term in office. By now it should have been clear to White Britons that despite her cynical talk of indigenous culture being "swamped" by immigration, Margaret Thatcher had no intention of reversing the tide, since her brand of neo-liberal capitalism depended on an inexorable internationalism. For all the rhetoric of Little Englander opposition to the European superstate, Thatcher tied Britain yet more closely to the European project by signing the Single European Act in 1986. A year earlier she had surrendered yet more supposedly treasured sovereignty by signing the Anglo-Irish Agreement with Dublin's Taoiseach Dr Garret FitzGerald.

Griffin's radical faction (now calling itself the Official NF) boasted to members during late 1986 that the party would field fifty candidates at the next general election, thus qualifying for nationwide television and radio broadcasts, but a parliamentary by-election in the South London constituency of Greenwich in February 1987 demonstrated the weakness of both factions. The Griffinites were unable to find a candidate, while the NFSG (better known as the Flag Group) put up the recently released Joe Pearce. John Tyndall's BNP, hitherto seen as much smaller than the NF, had the advantage of a local man as their candidate - the young Ian Dell.

At the 1981 GLC election the NF had polled 1.4% in Greenwich and the Tyndallite NNF 1.0%. Six years on the position had declined still further and the combined nationalist vote was a minuscule 0.6%. In retrospect there was some significance in the fact that Ian Dell received slightly more votes than Pearce. Until Greenwich the BNP had never defeated the NF in any election; after Greenwich the BNP (whether under Tyndall or more recently under Griffin) has so far come out on top in all such contests with the NF.

It was clear to the Griffinites that they would be unable to fulfil their fifty candidate pledge, especially following a change in the law which increased election deposits to £500 per constituency, so they made a virtue of necessity and announced that the ballot box was a waste of time. From now on Griffin and the Official NF (with a single exception which will be mentioned in the next issue) avoided all parliamentary elections and concentrated on building revolutionary "cadres" as advocated by the Libyan leader Col. Gadaffi.

The Flag Group remained in theory committed to election campaigning, though in practice too weak to fight a serious general election campaign in June 1987. Martin Wingfield therefore announced that there would be no Flag Group candidates, but one activist - Paul Kingston in Bristol East - disobeyed these orders. Kingston lost his deposit with 286 votes (0.6%), slightly down on the NF's 1983 vote. (*H&D*'s editor was among his campaign workers!)

With Thatcher returned for a third term in office there were three very weak nationalist alternatives: a radical 'Third Positionist' Official NF, a populist Flag Group, and a hard line racial nationalist BNP. Few would have predicted the source of British nationalism's next rise to international prominence.

Peter Rushton, Manchester, England

Editor's note: Part VIII of this series will appear in Issue 37

Subscribe to Heritage and Destiny

To make sure of your regular copy of *Heritage and Destiny* why not become a subscriber? The following rates are for the next six issues: USA/Canada \$35.00; British Isles £20.00; Worldwide £25.00/\$35.00.

Bulk Rates

Discounts for bulk purchases are as follows: 10 copies - £15.00; 20 copies - £25.00; 30 copies - £30.00: Postage is free within the UK. For over 30 copies in the UK or US/ Worldwide rates please contact our office.

Back Issues

All back issues (numbers 1-35) are also available at £4.00/\$6.00 each (post-paid).

Enamel Pin Badges now available

We now have the following high quality Patriotic enamel pin badges for sale: Proud to be Anglo-Saxon; BNP; Union Jack; Enoch Powell was right; Kilroy was right; England - Love it or leave it; Keep St. George in my heart; English and Proud; England - No Surrender; 100% English; St. George cross English Flag; England flag shield; England - No Asylum Seekers; English Red Rose; English White Rose; English 3 lions; Scottish flag; Scottish Lion; Welsh Red Dragon flag; Northern Ireland flag; Ulster Loyalist; English Bulldog; English Lion; England-Stone Island; English Crusader; English White Rose; English Red Rose; White Pride Celtic Cross; Red, White & Blue Celtic Cross; Red & White Celtic Cross; Red, Black & White Celtic Cross; Red, White & Blue Odal Rune; White English Dragon; Crossed English & Union Jack flags, with 3 lions crest; and Crossed England & Confederate flags, crossed England and White Dragon flags, Phoenix and Sunwheel: £2.50 (\$5.00) each or any five (mixed) for £10.00 (\$20.00) (post-paid).

Patriotic Flags now available

We now have the following good quality 3x5 flags for sale at £10.00/\$20.00 each. ; England Three Lions; English White Dragon; Isle of Man; Jersey; Guernsey; Ulster; St. George Cross; Welsh Red Dragon and Confederate Battle. For overseas orders please add another £2.00 (\$4.00) for postage.

Donations

Income from sales and subscriptions of our magazine are not enough to cover the high cost of production, mailing and administrative costs. We therefore rely on regular donations from our supporters so we can keep going. Every Dollar, Pound or even Euro counts, so please try and send in whatever you can afford.

Payment Details

Checks or Money orders should be made payable to *Heritage and Destiny* and sent to either; BCM Box 7318, London, WC1N 3XX, UK or PO Box 6501, Falls Church, VA 22046, USA. Please do not send cash, unless by recorded delivery. Or pay by paypal to - heritageanddestiny@yahoo.com



Book Review: *IQ and the Wealth of Nations* - by Richard Lynn and Tatu Vanhanen - Part One



Published by Praeger, ISBN 0-275-97510-X, 320pp, hardback. Available for £59.95 from Marston Book Services Ltd, 160 Milton Park, Abingdon OX14 4SD, UK, or online at www.amazon.co.uk for £51.95 (post-paid) or at www.amazon.com for \$82.36 (post-paid).

From the spoutings of buffoons in red noses and ageing rock stars with their sundry Reliefs and Aids to hand-wringings in the media, it is impossible to miss the fact that wealth is unevenly distributed among the nations of the world. Close examination of the reasons for this is generally discouraged, beyond a general message that they are poor because we are rich and that Whitey must start his or her life by always finishing the least appetising vegetable matter placed on his or her plate, and later dig deep and endlessly into his or her pockets, for the sake of the poor Third Worlders.

But some have gone beyond this facile level to ask why they are poor and we are rich. Explanations proffered fall into two categories – exogenous and endogenous. Exogenous theories find the explanation for the fact that nations today vary in wealth by a factor of more than twentyfold per head of population in external factors affecting the people of each nation – geography, natural resources, climate, native pests and diseases etc.

Poor countries tend to be tropical, poor in resources, too dry or too wet, and afflicted by dire diseases of people and livestock. Though, as the authors of this book point out, that doesn't explain why countries like the "Democratic Republic of the Congo", with some of the world's largest reserves of rare and important metal ores, Gabon, built on massive manganese reserves, and diamond-rich Sierra Leone are among the poorest countries per head, and indeed in terms of quality of life, on the planet.

Historical/economic theories blaming Third World poverty on First World exploitation and colonialism are of course a liberal and Marxist staple. As we shall see, they fail because they are not, ironically, a radical analysis enough – the root of the problem lies before the two "worlds" met a few hundred years ago. Perhaps the best and most comprehensive attempt to explain the roots of this issue in such terms is biologist Jared Diamond's *Guns, Germs and Steel*, worth reading because, in this reviewer's opinion, Diamond is partly right. As we shall see, my view is that the rest of the correct explanation is given by Lynn and Verhanen here.



Richard Lynn, Emeritus Professor of Psychology at the University of Ulster, Coleraine, who has written several books examining racial differences and intelligence

Endogenous theories examine – with varying degrees of Political Incorrectness in today's climate – factors internal to the peoples themselves. Culture is just about socially acceptable, although S.P. Huntingdon, writing in 2000 in *Culture Matters: How Values Shape Human Progress*, is likely to find himself in a spot of bother for explaining the fact that South Korea and Ghana had more or less the same wealth per head in 1950 but now the Asian country is 25 times richer per capita than the Africans thus:

South Koreans valued thrift, investment, hard work, education, organization, and discipline. Ghanaians had different values.

No doubt he means the Africans were other-worldly hippies uninterested in mere material wealth and happy to watch their children starve rather than – perish the thought – bone-idle kaffirs...

However, the ultimate in endogenous explanations takes the Politically Correct bull by the horns and looks for causal factors in the inhabitants of the nations concerned. Which is what Lynn and Vanhanen do. Noting that measured intelligence – IQ – correlates well with the achievements, and usually therefore wealth – of individuals, they take the next logical step and look at whether the average measured intelligence – IQ – of nations correlates with their wealth also.

Professor Lynn, in particular, is well equipped to do so as one of the most eminent psychologists working in the field of IQ in the world. Graduating and taking his PhD at Cambridge, Professor Lynn ended his distinguished career as Professor Emeritus at the University of Ulster. He has been in the forefront of research into differences in intelligence between individuals and groups for decades.

His co-author, Professor Tatu Vanhanen, is Professor Emeritus of Political Science at the University of Tampere, Finland, and the father of Finnish Prime Minister Matti Vanhanen.

This work is as solidly researched and edited as one would expect from such expert authors. It is fair to start by warning the reader that it is not light reading. It is a massively researched and rigorously argued academic treatise, with the authors' argument advancing inexorably behind a barrage of tables and graphs. No mercy is shown to the lay reader – a grasp of the meaning of statistical concepts such as positive and negative correlation, statistical significance etc is assumed.

The authors start by reviewing the various alternative theories on offer, which are cogently criticised and their weaknesses held up for the reader to see. In particular, Jared Diamond's thesis that Africa is, and throughout history always has been, backward compared to Asia and Europe because it is isolated and lacks domesticable animals and plants is shown to be factually wrong on both counts.

In fact, there is no external reason in the African climate or fauna why van Riebeck and co. could not have been greeted when they landed at the Cape of Good Hope by Zulus mounted on zebras. Or on the African elephants Hannibal took over the Alps. Sent from cities set amid fields of sorghum and millet, and herds of domesticated wildebeest, eland and buffalo. With tame guinea fowl pecking around the farmsteads. In a climate the same as that which nurtured Greece and Rome.

Zebras, elephant and eland have been tamed by Europeans, and in the case of zebras trained to pull carriages. Domestication, of course, takes many generations of breeding from the most tractable and culling the less. But zebras are no wilder than the tarpan ancestors of Dobbin and Red Rum. Whilst Buttercup the amiable dairy milchcow was bred from the aurochs, a beast bigger and more dangerous than the Cape buffalo. Europeans in Southern Africa have proved that large antelope like eland can be ranched for food even before they have been domesticated. And native African animals are not susceptible to the deadly tsetse fly-borne plagues that until recently made most of Africa a no-go area for cattle and horses.

The Africans didn't do it because it couldn't be done. They didn't do it because they couldn't do it.

On the other hand, Lynn and Vanhanen do not really effectively challenge Diamond on the question of why the Americas lagged behind. In this author's opinion because, just as he is wrong about Africa, Diamond is right about the Americas. They were isolated from the Great Continent of Europe-Asia-Africa (which is really one land mass) and as a result – although unlike the Africans they evolved indigenous civilizations (at least twice, independently) – these civilizations were unable to withstand contact with Europeans. Partly because they were less advanced - at about the level of Sumer in Eurasia 5000 years ago. Not helped by the fact that their ancestors had with great forethought hunted American horses, camels and elephants to extinction when they arrived in the New World over 10,000 years earlier. So they really didn't have many domesticable animals afterwards.

The Inca, Maya, Aztecs and their precursors were forced to scrape around among dogs and – in the Inca case – camelids like llamas, and guinea pigs for domestic animals (bison could doubtless have been domesticated also, but did not occur in the heartlands of the American civilizations). And partly because for over a hundred centuries they had been quarantined from the diseases – many spread from domestic animals after the coming of farming – sweeping through the peoples of the Old World. Including, as Diamond has to admit though it works against his "isolated sub-Saharan Africa" thesis, the Africans.

The result is that when White Men reached the Americas, 95% of the natives perished from smallpox and other introduced diseases. Which didn't happen when our ancestors reached even the farthest southern tip of Africa. Hence the White settlers reduced the natives to a tiny minority in much of North America, whilst being swamped by the indigenes in Southern and Eastern Africa. As Lynn and Vanhanen observe, the Maya, who built an advanced civilization in the tropical rainforests of Central America, challenge theories that suggest such environments are the reason there are now no great stone pyramids and ruined cities in the similar forests of the Congo.

Having reviewed alternatives, Lynn and Vanhanen move on to make their own case. They start by explaining what IQ is, and why it matters. They also address the objection that IQ tests measure how good the subject is at assimilating European cultural values and ideas – although in fact since what they are seeking to explain is why some countries like Japan and South Korea have been so good at succeeding on the terms of European civilization and culture whilst others like Gabon and Guatemala have not, this objection could well be argued to be irrelevant even if valid.

If low measured IQ means you are bad at getting on in the European civilization which now envelops the Earth then that is a good reason why nations who have low average IQs do get on badly in it. They may be White Man's Tests but the issue is how well people and nations get on in what culturally and economically is basically a White Man's World, even if it is no longer run by or for White people. Indeed, as the authors point out, IQ, including national average IQs, correlates well with tests of reaction times to stimuli – which can be administered to monkeys as easily as to people and thus are wholly culture-free.


They then move on to the heart of the matter, correlating average IQ and wealth per head for the 81 countries where IQs have been measured on a sufficient scale. The results are interesting. What emerges is a graph like a tilted trumpet.

For countries – mostly in sub-Saharan Africa but also in countries in Latin America with a large African ethnic component – with average IQs below 90 (the IQ of the UK is – because of the way the tests were calibrated – exactly 100 and the USA average is 98) wealth per head correlates very well indeed with average IQ.

The dumber a nation's people are, on average, the poorer they are. In fact the line is bent up at the bottom because Lynn and Vanhanen assume you can't have a negative Gross Domestic Product per head. Given that the afflicted countries, Equatorial Guinea and its ilk, probably consume more in Western charity handouts and foreign aid than they produce it seems to me possible that their GDP is indeed, negative – they are net consumers of the world's wealth, sponging off the West's charity.


Reviewed by Ian Freeman, Northwich, Cheshire

Editor's note: Part 2 of Ian Freeman's review of IQ and the Wealth of Nations will appear in Issue 37 of H&D (July-September 2009)



COLIN JORDAN DEFIANT & UNREPENTANT

Hour long autographed CD in which Colin Jordan sees off three interviewers that seek to blame him & the White Defence League for the 1958 Notting Hill riots & subsequent murder of a black man. A fascinating insight into the early years of National Socialism in this country. Cheques/po's, cash to D. ETTRIDGE, PO BOX 52185, LONDON E2 0WS. (£10.00 - including p&p).



THE MISSING LINK
to understanding what's really going on in this country and the world is the true identity of the Children of Light and the Children of Darkness. Have you been a Christian-Patriot for many years and found that some things just "don't add up"? The real nature of the forces of good and evil have been hidden from our people through politically correct manipulation from the government, the media, the schools, and the churches by both the so-called "right" and "left".

Learn the missing message that links it all together, clarifies the confusion, and reveals your racial destiny, by ordering a copy of the book **YOUR HERITAGE** for only \$2.50. Included will be a FREE copy of our Doctrinal Statement of Beliefs and lists of other books, tapes, and videos opening your eyes to amazing truths that you haven't seen before.

Kingdom Identity Ministries
P.O. Box 1021
Harrison, Arkansas 72602 USA
Visit our website at: www.kingidentity.com

The New Right - Troy Southgate Replies

I was extremely surprised and disappointed to read the comments made by David J. Wingfield (*The West Reborn?: Reflections on the New Right on the Fortieth Anniversary of GRECE*) in Issue 35 of *Heritage & Destiny*, particularly as I have a keen interest in the traditionalist concepts that Mr. Wingfield claims to support. But rather than comment on his analysis of the New Right in Europe, which seems fairly accurate, I will concentrate on the various points he raised about my role in politics over the last twenty years and the current position of the New Right in the British Isles.

At times, Mr. Wingfield's choice of words would not seem out of place in a decidedly hostile magazine like *Searchlight* and, whilst I can live with phrases like 'indefatigable political animal', his adjectives do tend to take a slightly nastier turn as the article proceeds and later on I am said to be of a 'turbulent' character. I'd hardly use this term to describe a man who has been married for nineteen years, earned a university degree as a mature student and successfully educated his four children at home.

The National Revolutionary Faction (NRF), meanwhile, is dismissed as 'a tiny and bizarre movement', despite the fact that Integral Tradition Publishing - the same company that publishes *The Initiate* in which the article first appeared - saw fit to publish my own collected writings in December 2007. I hardly think that a small membership automatically relegates a group of this kind to the realms of the 'bizarre', not least when the NRF has been seriously discussed in several mainstream books and used as the central theme of a 25-page essay in a prestigious academic journal committed to the examination of the Radical Right.

It is also alleged that the NRF 'spent most of their energies in-fighting' when, in fact, this is completely unsubstantiated and during the late-1990s we had a very committed and loyal hardcore of activists. The NRF was also voluntarily disbanded once it had adopted a National-Anarchist strategy: it never dissolved amid personality clashes or other such nonsense.

It is also incorrect to describe National-Anarchism itself as 'anti-authoritarian'. Indeed, whilst we do not believe that a State should act on behalf of the Community, we do fully accept concepts such as authority, hierarchy and caste and completely reject the senseless egalitarianism of the Left. And if National-Anarchism 'is far removed in temperament and goals from the New Right as it is commonly understood', Mr. Wingfield needs to study *The French New Right in the Year 2000* by Alain de Benoist and Charles Champetier, a Manifesto with which we have an immense amount in common, both in form and in spirit.

Elsewhere, he alleges that the philosophy of the New Right 'remains recognisably National-Anarchist'. This, once again, is completely untrue. The Committee of the New Right is comprised of individuals from various backgrounds, including the British National Party, Woden's Folk and both Hermetic and Synarchist circles. In fact I am the only individual who would describe himself as a National-Anarchist and I have little doubt that my associates would be quite perturbed to find themselves needlessly pigeonholed in this way.

At our meetings, for example, you will find stalls selling literature produced by the British National Party (BNP), National Front (NF), Populist Party and British People's Party (BPP), all of which I happen to oppose politically. Mr. Wingfield also claims that New Right meetings are attended by a mixture of 'old-fashioned British nationalists, affected public school types complete with blazers and mustard trousers' and 'pig-ignorant neo-Nazi skinheads'. In reality, however, these so-called 'public school types' are actually members of the Sheridan Club - many of whom have an interest in Futurism - and the Romantics, who have strong Evolian sympathies. Such people dress in the style of the 1920s and 1930s both

deliberately and consciously, because they are making an effort to detach themselves from the modern world.

But there are no 'skinheads' at our meetings and this is obviously a reference to one individual with short hair and a baseball cap who decided to make a nuisance of himself by selling illegal DVDs and drinking far too much alcohol. As a result, he was banned from ever attending again. Consequently, I was reported to the police and was told that the venue was no longer available for use and therefore I was hardly enamoured by his presence, either.

But the main problem I have with Mr. Wingfield's article, is that it is ridiculously negative and unhelpful. It is fair to say that we have faced problems here in England by trying to establish a New Right presence based on the Continental model that began in 1968, but rather than try to become involved himself or make positive suggestions about how we can improve things and make greater progress, the author of this piece stands on the sidelines and bombs us with cheap insults about 'sweaty pubs', when the majority of our meetings have been staged at a very plush location in the City of London. In fact, and perhaps ironically, it was the former Hong Kong Bank.

Furthermore, the statement that 'New Right groups would meet with more success if they took a less dogmatic view on political involvement' is quite ludicrous. In fact the New Right is the only Right-wing organisation in the British Isles that asks its members to leave their political baggage at the door. There is no dogma, there is no official line, hence the wide variety of speakers that have participated at these events. But the more crucial point that Mr. Wingfield fails to grasp is that of the New Right and its development being a gradual process and we are taking things very slowly in order to introduce these ideas in this country for the first time. It isn't

easy, of course, and there is still a very long way to go, but articles like this sadly undermine the work we are doing to ensure that such ideas chip away at the average individual's dependence on the stale, parliamentarian edifice that has dominated nationalist politics for so many decades. We do have a clear vision, but in order to win the battle for hearts and minds we must proceed carefully so as not to alienate those intellectuals who may, over time, become our allies. We are simply taking one step at a time.

Troy Southgate, BM Box LCRN, London WC1N 3XX, England.



Troy Southgate, founder of the National Revolutionary Faction, describes himself as the lone voice of National Anarchism on the committee of the New Right

The Nationalist Times

The *Nationalist Times* is the monthly newspaper of Middle America. Each issue is packed with news and commentary on national and international events, politics, and the latest social trends.

A one year subscription to *The Nationalist Times* is available for only \$39.00 (or \$75.00 for two years). A one-year subscription for those living outside the U.S. is \$55.00. Or send \$5.00 for a sample copy to: **The Nationalist Times, 10161 Park Run Drive, Suite 150, Las Vegas, NV 89145, USA.** Check out *The Nationalist Times* website at www.anu.org and email them at mail@anu.org

Euro 2009 - is this Griffin's moment?

continued from page 2

Stoke City Council. His wife and fellow Stoke councillor Ellie is number five on the slate, while the remaining candidates are from Coventry, Dudley and Sandwell. Notably there is no candidate from Birmingham, England's second largest city. A BNP vote of around 11% would be enough to gain a West Midlands seat: last time the BNP's regional share was 7.5%.

In the South-West region the BNP slate is headed by recent recruit Jeremy Wotherspoon, a retired businessman now living in Devon. Thirty years ago he was a prominent activist in the Martin Webster faction of the National Front. Number two is Bournemouth organiser Barry Bennett. We can expect the regional campaign to be overshadowed by the UKIP candidature of the Earl of Dartmouth, stepbrother of the late Diana, Princess of Wales. A BNP victory in the South West is almost impossible, since the party's vote would have to rise from 3% to around 11.5%.

Eddy Butler, whose on-off alliance with Nick Griffin is one of the great mysteries of nationalist politics, heads the party's Eastern England slate, above Thurrock councillor Emma Colgate, who works for the BNP's GLA member Richard Barnbrook and is the daughter of a National Front activist. All of Mr Butler's strategic expertise will be needed here, as more than double the BNP's 2004 vote of 4.3% will be needed.

The North East BNP has a virtually impossible target of about 17%, since their region only elects three MEPs. Here the party's slate is headed by Adam Walker, President of the controversial BNP "trade union" Solidarity, and also includes regional organiser Ken Booth, a prominent National Front official until a few years ago.

Yet another famous name from the NF heads the BNP slate in the Yorkshire region - former NF chairman Andrew Brons, who was controversially selected ahead of Leeds councillor Chris Beverley (now number three on the slate). Brons shares with Martin Wingfield the distinction of having been expelled from the NF by Nick Griffin! Also on the Yorkshire slate are Wakefield activist Nick Cass, Marlene Guest from Rotherham, Paul Harris from Barnsley, and former Bradford NF candidate Trevor Brown from the party's defunct York branch. Mr Brons has a reasonable chance of election, needing to increase the BNP's regional vote to about 11.5% from 2004's 8%.

One area where the BNP is very unlikely to gain a seat is London, where the party made its first breakthrough in 1993 and hit the headlines again last year by electing Richard Barnbrook to the Greater London Assembly. Five years ago the BNP polled 4% across the London region. Richard Barnbrook only polled 2.8% of first preferences in last year's mayoral election, and the BNP's London-wide slate polled 5.3%: just enough to elect Barnbrook to the Assembly, but a long way short of the Euro-target, which is about 8.5%. Heading the London slate for Europe will be Barking councillor Rob Bailey.

Seeking re-election as an MEP in Italy will be Nick Griffin's former business partner Roberto Fiore, a close ally during the 1980s National Front split. Fiore now leads Forza Nuova, a small Italian nationalist party which won representation in the European Parliament five years ago as part of an alliance with Alessandra Mussolini, granddaughter of Italy's wartime

leader. Luca Romagnoli of Fiamma Tricolore is another radical Italian nationalist MEP, but changes in the Italian political system mean that no such electoral success is likely this year.

In France, the Front National - for many years Europe's leading nationalist party - is likely to struggle this year following a series of splits. Last time the FN won seven European seats, after polling 9.8% of the nationwide vote, but most observers expect FN support to fall sharply, and the party could be overshadowed this year by expected successes for the French far left.

Austria is likely to produce the most interesting results. The Austrian Freedom Party (FPO) won five seats at the 1999 election then lost all but one of these in 2004. They will hope to do much better this year. The BZO, founded by former FPO leader Jörg Haider, is still to determine its long-term future following Haider's death.


In Belgium, the Flemish nationalist Vlaams Blok won three MEPs in 2004 with 14.3% of the vote, but was forced by court rulings on "racism" to change its name later that year to Vlaams Belang (Flemish Interest). VB's MEPs include party chairman Frank Vanhecke and Koen Dillen, son of the Vlaams Blok founder Karel Dillen. Regrettably the VB has betrayed much of Dillen's legacy, repositioning itself as a Griffin-style party allied with the neoconservative "clash of civilisations" agenda.

For a few months during 2007 an alliance of radical nationalist parties formed an official group in the European Parliament. Alongside the French, Belgian, Austrian and Italian members mentioned above, the group was also backed by Romanian and Bulgarian nationalists, and by the ex-UKIP maverick Ashley Mote. The Greater Romania Party has five MEPs, though its support has declined during the last few years and it could face wipeout in June. In Bulgaria, the National Union Attack party will hope to add to its single MEP and will be fighting a simultaneous general election campaign, where it could emerge as the second largest party.

A broader New Right alliance also includes tiny radical parties in Sweden, Spain and the Netherlands. Parties that some would define as radical nationalist have enjoyed success in Poland, Latvia and Lithuania. Whether or not Nick Griffin is elected in June, European nationalist politics is facing a time of transition, with traditional notions of left and right being redefined by the crisis of globalism and the bloody failure of neocon military interventions. In the next *H&D* we will examine some of the new alliances and opportunities now on the agenda.

Peter Rushton, Manchester, England

OK it's back to me now. If you are an active Nationalist, why not buy some extra copies of this issue to give out (or sell them!) at your next branch meeting - it's a great issue and should 'sell like hot cakes'! And as always we also need your regular donations - however large or small, every Dollar, Pound or even Euro counts. Please try and send in whatever you can afford. Thanks once again for your support, together we will win.



At least eight former National Front activists - including three former NF Chairmen - will be standing as BNP candidates for the European Parliament on June 4th.

(above left to right) Andrew Brons, first on the Yorkshire & Humber list; Martin Wingfield, second in the North West; Jeremy Wotherspoon, first in the South West; Trevor Brown, fifth in Yorkshire & Humber

(below left to right) Ken Booth, third in the North East; Eddy Butler, first in Eastern England; Simon Darby, first in the West Midlands; and Nick Griffin, first in the North West

How Relevant is Holocaust Revisionism?

For more than 30 years, writers and publicists who call themselves revisionists have presented evidence and arguments questioning generally accepted accounts of the Holocaust. Some of these researchers have shown impressive fortitude - defying smears, abuse, physical violence, and worse.

In countries where "Holocaust denial" is a crime, skeptics have been fined, imprisoned or forced into exile for expressing dissident views on this issue. These victims of what amounts to a blatant suppression of free speech include Robert Faurisson and Roger Garaudy in France, Siegfried Verbeke in Belgium, Jürgen Graf and Gaston-Armand Amaudruz in Switzerland, and Ernst Zundel and Germar Rudolf in Germany.

Revisionists have published impressive evidence, including long neglected documents and testimony, that has contributed to a more complete and accurate understanding of an emotion-laden and highly polemicized chapter of history.

I have played a role in this effort. In published writings, in lectures, and in courtroom testimony, I have devoted much time and work to critically reviewing the "official" Holocaust narrative, to countering Holocaust propaganda, and to debunking specific Holocaust claims.

But in spite of years of effort by revisionists, including some serious work that on occasion has forced "mainstream" historians to make startling concessions, there has been little success in convincing people that the familiar Holocaust story is defective.

This lack of success is not difficult to understand. Revisionists are up against a well-organized, decades-long campaign that is promoted in the mass media, reinforced in classrooms, and supported by politicians.

Tim Cole, a history professor and prominent specialist of Holocaust studies, has written in his book *Selling the Holocaust*: "From a relatively slow start, we have now come to the point where Jewish culture in particular, and Western culture more generally, are saturated with the 'Holocaust'. Indeed, the 'Holocaust' has saturated Western culture to such an extent that it appears not only centre stage, but also lurks in the background. This can be seen in the remarkable number of contemporary movies which include the 'Holocaust' as plot or sub-plot."

Between 1989 and 2003 alone, more than 170 films with Holocaust themes were made. In many American and European schools, a focus on the wartime suffering of Europe's Jews is obligatory. Every major American city has at least one Holocaust museum or memorial. The largest is the US Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, DC, which is run by a taxpayer-funded federal government agency, and draws some two million visitors yearly.

A number of countries, including Britain, Germany and Italy, officially observe an annual Holocaust Remembrance Day. The United Nations General Assembly in 2005 approved a resolution introduced by Israel to designate January 27 as an international Holocaust remembrance day.

In the United States and western Europe, the Holocaust has become a venerated, semi-religious *mythos*. Prof. Michael Goldberg, an eminent rabbi, has written of what he calls a "Holocaust cult with its own tenets of faith, rites and shrines." In this age of secular "political correctness," Holocaust "denial" is the modern equivalent of sacrilege.

A major reason for the lack of success in persuading people that conventional Holocaust accounts are fraudulent or exaggerated is that - as revisionists acknowledge - Jews in Europe were, in fact, singled out during the war years for especially severe treatment.

This was confirmed, for example, by German propaganda minister Joseph Goebbels in these confidential entries in his wartime diary:

Feb. 14, 1942: *The Führer [Hitler] once again expresses his resolve ruthlessly to clear the Jews out of Europe. There must be no squeamish sentimentalism about it. The Jews have deserved the catastrophe that they are now experiencing. Their destruction will go hand in hand with the destruction of our enemies. We must hasten this process with cold ruthlessness.*

March 27, 1942: *The Jews are now being deported to the East from the Generalgouvernement [Poland], starting around Lublin. The procedure is a pretty barbaric one and not to be described here more definitely, and there's not much left of the Jews. By and large, one can say that 60 percent of them will have to be liquidated, while only 40 percent can be put to work. The former Gauleiter of Vienna, who is carrying out the operation, is proceeding quite judiciously, using a method that is not all too conspicuous. The Jews are facing a judgment which, while barbaric, they fully deserve. The prophecy the Führer made about them for having brought on a new world war is beginning to come true in the most terrible manner. One must not be sentimental in these matters.*

April 29, 1942: *Short shrift is being made of the Jews in all eastern occupied territories. Tens of thousands of them are being wiped out.*

No informed person disputes that Europe's Jews did, in fact, suffer a great catastrophe during the Second World War. Millions were forced from their homes and deported to brutal internment in crowded ghettos and camps. Jewish communities across Central and Eastern Europe, large and small, were wiped out. Millions lost their lives. When the war ended in 1945, most of the Jews of Germany, Poland, the Netherlands and other countries were gone.

Given all this, it should not be surprising that even well-founded revisionist arguments are often dismissed as heartless quibbling.

But despite a discouraging record of achievement, some revisionists insist that

their work is vitally important because success in exposing the Holocaust as a hoax will deliver a shattering blow to Israel and Jewish-Zionist power. This view, however, is based on a mistaken understanding of the relationship between "Holocaust remembrance" and Jewish-Zionist power.


Even before World War II, the organized Jewish community was playing a major role in the political and cultural life of Europe and the United States, and the Zionist movement was already very influential. Although propaganda about the wartime catastrophe of Europe's Jews was a factor in American society during the 1950s and 1960s, it was not until the late 1970s that "the Holocaust" began to play a really significant social-political role. It was not until the late 1970s and early 1980s that the term began to appear as a specific entry in standard encyclopedias and reference books, and became an obligatory subject in American textbooks and classrooms.

In short, the Holocaust assumed an important role in the social-cultural life of America and western Europe in keeping with, and as an expression of, a phenomenal increase in Jewish influence and power. The Holocaust "remembrance" campaign is not so much a source of Jewish-Zionist power as it is an expression of it. For that reason, debunking the Holocaust will not shatter that power.

Suppose *The New York Times* were to report tomorrow that Israel's Yad Vashem Holocaust center and the US Holocaust Memorial Museum had announced that no more than one million Jews died during World War II, and that no Jews were killed in gas chambers at Auschwitz. The impact on Jewish-Zionist power would surely be minimal.

Although "Holocaust remembrance" remains well entrenched in our society, its impact seems to have diminished in recent years. In part this is because the men and women of the World War II generation are nearly all gone. But another factor has been a major shift in the world-political situation. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the Soviet empire, the end of US-Soviet "Cold War" rivalry, the Nine-Eleven terror attack in 2001, the US invasion and occupation of Iraq, and current world economic crisis, have ushered in a new era - one in which the Holocaust imagery of the 1940s is less potent because it's less relevant.

Criticism of Israel and its policies has become much more common in recent years, even in the United States. Among thoughtful men and women, and especially in the youth, sympathy for Israel has fallen perceptibly, while skepticism about the role of the Holocaust in society has grown. Tony Judt, a prominent Jewish scholar who lives and works in New York, wrote recently:



Mark Weber is the full-time director of the Institute for Historical Review - has he deserted his post?

Students today do not need to be reminded of the genocide of the Jews, the historical consequences of anti-Semitism, or the problem of evil. They know all about these – in ways our parents never did. And that is as it should be. But I have been struck lately by the frequency with which new questions are surfacing: 'Why do we focus so much on the Holocaust?' 'Why is it illegal [in certain countries] to deny the Holocaust but not other genocides?' 'Is the threat of anti-Semitism not exaggerated?' And, increasingly, 'Doesn't Israel use the Holocaust as an excuse?' I do not recall hearing those questions in the past.

This shift has also been noticed at the Institute for Historical Review. Over the past ten years, sales of IHR books, discs, flyers and other items about Holocaust history have steadily declined, along with inquiries about Holocaust history and requests for interviews on this subject. At the same time, and obviously reflecting broader social-cultural trends, there has been a marked rise in sales of IHR books, discs, flyers and other items about Jewish-Zionist power, the role of Jews in society, and so forth. This has been matched by an increase in the number of inquiries and requests for interviews on those issues.

Jewish-Zionist power is a palpable reality with harmful consequences for America, the Middle East, and the entire global community. In my view, and as I have repeatedly emphasized, the task of exposing and countering this power is a crucially important one. In that effort, Holocaust revisionism cannot play a central role.

One influential statesman who seems to understand this is the former prime minister of Malaysia, Mahathir Mohamed. In a much-discussed address delivered at an international conference in October 2003, he spoke forthrightly against Jewish-Zionist power, while making clear that he accepts the familiar "Six Million" Holocaust narrative. In the global struggle against this power, he said, "we are up against a people who think ... We cannot fight them through brawn alone. We must use our brains also ... The Europeans killed six million Jews out of twelve million. But today the Jews rule this world by proxy. They get others to fight and die for them."

Setting straight the historical record about the wartime fate of Europe's Jews is a worthy endeavor. But there should be no illusions about its social-political relevance. In the real world struggle against Jewish-Zionist power, Holocaust revisionism has proved to be as much a hindrance as a help.

Mark Weber, IHR, California

Editor's note: Mark Weber has been the director of the Institute for Historical Review since 1995. He studied history at the University of Illinois (Chicago), the University of Munich, Portland State University and Indiana University (M.A., 1977). In March 1988 he testified for five days in Toronto District Court as a recognized expert witness on Germany's wartime Jewish policy and the Holocaust issue.

The European Perspective

Mark Weber's apparent apostasy has caused controversy across the revisionist movement. Scholars such as Arthur Butz and Robert Faurisson, as well as longstanding revisionist campaigners, have tried to pin down exactly what Mr Weber's position on revisionism now is, when and why he changed his mind, and whether he will now step down from the IHR. Such matters may become clearer in due course.

Ignoring such omissions, and turning to the substance of Mr Weber's article, I find some points of agreement. Whatever happened to Europe's Jews sixty or seventy years ago, the central issue of our times is the overwhelming power of the 21st century Jewish lobby - and the most interesting current

political development is the emergence of new coalitions redefining left and right in response (more on these developments in the next *H&D*).

Mr Weber's formulation of this argument leaves revisionists open to the standard allegation that their theories are merely an attempt to excuse national socialism and revive anti-semitism. It must be restated yet again that revisionists do not deny that many Jews were killed and many more suffered during the Second World War. Early revisionists included not only former allies of national socialism such as Louis Darquier de Pellepoix, but also former leftists who had themselves been prisoners in national socialist camps, such as Paul Rassinier.

European readers will find a good deal of American parochialism in Mr Weber's thesis, and may also suspect that recent events have made his line outdated almost as soon as it was published. Can he really believe that a comprehensive public refutation of the six million and gas chamber myths would have no effect on Zionist power?

The sheer extent of debate denial across Europe is one reason why Holocaust revisionism (or more precisely the defence of the rights of Holocaust revisionists) will remain central to what Mr Weber defines as "the task of exposing and countering ... Jewish-Zionist power". German lawyer Horst Mahler has just received a six year prison sentence, joining his fellow lawyer and fiancée Sylvia Stoltz, research chemist Germar Rudolf and publisher Ernst Zündel who are already in jail for the "crime" of voicing forbidden opinions.

At the end of February an unprecedented barrage of media attention greeted Bishop Richard Williamson on his return to London, where he was immediately threatened with potential extradition to Germany under a European Arrest Warrant. A few months previously the Australian academic Fredrick Töben successfully fought off a similar extradition attempt, once again in the full glare of media attention. A recent appearance on the

BBC by the co-ordinator of Dr Töben's defence campaign, Lady Michèle Renouf, caused outrage among Zionist campaigners, who accused the BBC of having "put the voice of Holocaust denial in front of the microphone to send its message to the worldwide BBC audience."

Meanwhile the Muslim Council of Great Britain has delivered a major setback to the Jewish lobby by reinstating its boycott of Holocaust Memorial Day. Pretty much the only success for this area of Jewish lobbying in recent months has been the BNP leadership's uncritical acceptance of Holocaustianity dogma.

While controversial as ever and as yet incomplete, David Irving's continuing reassessment of the Holocaust, examining the so-called Operation Reinhardt camps while rejecting the centrality of Auschwitz "gassings", presents another serious challenge to the accepted exterminationist narrative. Prof. Robert Faurisson's famous document outlining "Twenty Revisionist Victories" is unlikely to be mothballed, as Weber's thesis would imply, and is more likely to require expansion.

The essential question remains unanswered and must therefore be asked again and again. Were there any homicidal gas chambers in Auschwitz? If there were - and especially if they were used to murder a large proportion of the 1.5 million alleged victims at the camp - orthodox historians should be able to produce evidence that stands up to the methods of revisionist research and analysis that are norms in every other academic field.

Clearly unacceptable by any standards is the jailing of researchers, publishers (and now even lawyers!) who seek to maintain such norms. For as long as such jailing continues and such questions are evaded, revisionists (with or without the help of Mark Weber and the IHR) will still have an urgent task before them.

Peter Rushton, Manchester, England

Editor's note: for continuing updates on the persecution of revisionists, visit - www.jailingopinions.com

The People of Northern Europe - Part X

The Founding of the Modern Nations of Western Europe - The Anglo-Saxons

After the withdrawal of the Roman troops from England in the early part of the fifth century, the partly Romanized Celtic peoples of Central and Eastern England were attacked so persistently by the Picts and Scots from the North that the Celtic leaders, despairing of help from Rome, called upon the Saxons for assistance. The story of Arioivistus was repeated, but this time there was no Julius Caesar. According to tradition (and the tradition appears to represent approximately what happened) the Saxons under Hengist and Horsa, with Jutish and Anglian contingents (and possibly adventurers from other nations), crossed the North Sea and after forcing the Picts and Scots to return home, settled in the country in large numbers in the eastern half of the island as well as in part of the south.

Some information about these events is given in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and in the Latin ecclesiastical writings of those days. But we are not dependent upon this evidence alone; there is no doubt that the archaeological evidence bears witness to the approximate accuracy of the Anglo-Saxon and Latin documents. This movement of the Jutes, Angles and Saxons to England continued for almost a century. By that time the whole of England up to the Scottish border had been overrun and occupied, with the exception of portions of the Southwest, that area now called Wales and Cornwall. Here the Celtic language continued to prevail.

The consolidation of the various kingdoms that were established in England; the rivalries; the wars; the Irish missions; the mission of St. Augustine and the adherence of the new settlers to the Papal See at Rome; the invasions and settlements of the Danes; the conquest of the country by the Normans under William; the influence of the French language upon English; the eventual absorption of both Danes and Norman French by the Anglo-Saxons - all that is a part of English history as such, rather than of Germanic.

By the year 531 the Saxons had made themselves masters of the whole of the North Sea area. It was at this time that the Saxons in alliance with the Franks destroyed the Thuringian kingdom and extended their territory as far as the Saale and Unstrut rivers. For some time the Saxons were to a great extent dependent upon the Franks, to whom they had to pay tribute, and consequently had a very precarious hold on their extended territory. In 555 they challenged the Frankish suzerainty, but were defeated. In 567 they were involved in war as allies of the Langobards. Later they were in conflict with Slavic people pressing in from the East and after successfully defending the border against the Slavs, they once more became involved in war with the Franks. This new Frankish-Saxon war lasted intermittently from the time of the Frankish Martel in 718 to the time of Charles the Great, who conducted a thirty years' war against the Saxons. They were finally reduced to subjection and forcibly converted to Christianity, accompanied by the mass execution of virtually their entire nobility.

Adoption of Christianity On the continent this was the last stand of the old Germanic religion. It still lingered on in the Scandinavian North, and in Iceland until the year 1000, but in Germany itself it had to yield to the new belief that had behind it not only the former power and prestige of the Roman Empire, but also the growing influence of the Papal See at Rome. In addition, the call of the new religion was a summons to a new philosophy of life. Thus, one of the Anglian nobles in England, himself an officiate of the pagan religion, is reported by Bede to have declared that the old gods had done very little for him, and he had no objection to trying the new god.

It was not only the identification of the new religion with the power and prestige of the Roman Empire, nor the ideological appeal of the new faith, that brought about the downfall of the Germanic belief. The fact that the ancient beliefs and customs maintained themselves longer in the Scandinavian North, and the longest of all in the relatively isolated Iceland, shows quite clearly

that the long migrations and wanderings of the peoples had brought about a loosening of the old ties, a severance from the cult-centers, from the ancient symbols, from the sacred oaks and groves. This was a prime reason why the Germanic people adopted the new faith with relatively little friction. But neither to the Romans nor to the Germanic peoples did the new faith bring peace and the brotherhood of man.

The Bavarians. The Marcomanni constituted a constant threat to the security of the southern border. From about the middle of the second century to the middle of the fifth there were constant attempts to expand beyond their Bohemian home, with varying but insignificant success. After that, for some time nothing is known about their movements. When they reappear they have a different name. They are now the Baiuvari or modern Bavarians. The name itself is an ancient Celtic designation, meaning the men of the Boii; and the Germanic people who settled in Bohemia, presumably the Marcomanni, brought with them to Bavaria the name of their former home. In the early part of the sixth century the Bavarians, expanding south of the Danube, became neighbors of the Alemannian-Swabians. And that is approximately where the Bavarians are at the present time in spite of all the wars and occupations they have endured.

The Hessians. Hessen lies between the Elbe and the Rhine rivers. This is the former homeland of the Chatti in the days of the Roman wars. The consensus is that the Hessians are the lineal descendants of the Chatti, one of the nations of the Irminoni group.

The Chatti played quite an important role in the wars with Rome and are often mentioned, especially by Tacitus, who takes pains to describe their characteristics. Later they became part of the Frankish Empire.

The Franks. The Franks belonged to the western branch of the Germanic peoples and possibly constituted a confederacy comprising a great many small nations; mostly units of the Istvaeoni cult-group. This confederation took place about 240. The collective name 'Franks' did not make its appearance until 258. Opinions differ as to the meaning of the name 'Frank.' The theory that it means 'free' has been widely accepted, but there are other interpretations, such as defiant, bold, ferocious; and Grimm derived the word from 'framea,' meaning spear.

Some scholars place their starting-point or nucleus of the confederacy on the lower Rhine, but others see the Thuringian forest as the homeland. For the Latin-influenced Gregory of Tours, the historian of the Franks, there was a connection between the Franks and the Trojans, since for him the Franks could not have a less ancient and noble origin than Virgil's Romans, although this is clearly apocryphal.

In respect to the Germanic nations beyond the Rhine, the defensive strategy of Julius Caesar and Augustus was successful for a long time. Members of various nations did succeed in crossing the Rhine from time to time, but the Romans would either force them back or, allowing them to remain, colonize them, and often enrol them in the Roman legions. The latter policy was frequently applied by the Romans in the case of adventurous Frankish groups, who from time to time engaged in either raiding or land-seeking. The numbers of such parties were probably not very large and were often exaggerated by the Roman writers for obvious reasons. It was not until the formation of the "universal kingdom" by Chlodwig in 486 that any imperialistic policy could have been formulated.

From the time of the formation of the Frankish confederacy there was no permanent peace along the frontier. A slow and steady enlargement of Frankish territory took place at the expense of their Thuringian and Alemannian neighbors as well as of the Romans or Romanized Celts. The towns and cities were the chief objects of attack since they were the centers of wealth.

Some very strange and interesting events took place in the years before the Frankish unification. In 259, for instance, a large number of Franks made their way through Gaul and into Spain where they captured and destroyed Tarragona. After moving about in Spain for twelve years, they seized a



Arrival Of the Anglo-Saxons In Britain
Hengist and Horsa with their warriors
land in Britain, and are received with every
token of joy by the king of the Britons

number of Spanish ships and made their way to Africa, where they seem to have disappeared. Again, in the year 278 a number of Franks had been taken prisoners and had been sent to Thrace as colonists by the Emperor Prolus. But about 280 they apparently became thoroughly disillusioned with their new home and, seizing ships, made their way across the Mediterranean, through the Straits of Gibraltar and so back to their northern home.

The constant raids along the border were no doubt very irritating to the Roman Emperors and their representatives in Gaul, and often they reacted in a very barbarous manner. Shortly after the accession of Constantine the Great to supreme power there was a Frankish attack in the lower Rhine area. In 310 the Emperor made a counterattack, and, after devastating the country, brought a large number of prisoners back and had them thrown to the wild beasts in the arena of a local Gallic city for the amusement of the populace.

By about 400, the Christianization of Gaul had been almost completed. The Christianity of Gaul took the orthodox form. The Germanic nations - with the exception of the Goths and those more immediately associated with them, who had been converted to the Arian form of Christianity - were still pagan, including the members of the Frankish confederacy. This created a religious barrier to any long-term policy of settlement and assimilation of the Franks into the native population.

Collapse of the Roman Empire in the West. Early in the fifth century the internal weakness of the Roman Empire began to reveal serious breaches in the defensive system. In the East, the Goths under Alaric were on the move towards Italy and the West. Hordes of Vandals, Sacae and Alans were pouring across the border into Southern France and into Spain. These moves could no longer be described as raids; they were migrations of peoples, the uprooting of whole nations, bag and baggage, with wives and children, cattle and all possessions, with long trains of ox-drawn wagons, extending for miles.

It was at this time that the Romans were compelled to withdraw their garrisons from Britain while the Vandal Stilicho struggled to hold the Roman Empire together, which he might conceivably have been able to do if intrigues at the Imperial Court had not brought about his dismissal and death. It was at this time, too, that the Burgundians of Nibelungen fame were establishing themselves on the left bank of the Rhine. The Franks were also on the move.

The Germans were indeed gathering for the feast. But in spite of the Vandals in Spain and the Visigoths in Southern France; in spite of the occupation of England by Germanic peoples; in spite of the devastation in Italy; in spite of the internal apathy, corruption and jealousy, the Roman Empire was still able to make one last stand in defense of the ancient Mediterranean center of power, relying largely on German troops.

It was not Stilicho who led this defense; he had been "liquidated." It was Aetius, who seems to have been a man with a strong sense of duty - with the authority he exercised he might easily have set himself up as Emperor. But Aetius had few really Roman troops, and his legions were filled with contingents from practically every Germanic nation in the West. For the time being he succeeded in holding them together.

It was the march of Attila in A.D. 451 against the weakening Empire that brought about a temporary collaboration of so many rival forces in Western Europe. The great battle against Attila took place between Troyes and Chalons-sur-Marne. According to the chronicles the hordes of the Huns and their allies were as the sands on the seashore. The battle lasted all day, and seemed to be indecisive, the losses on both sides being great. Aetius prepared to continue the battle on the following morning, but Attila was found to have withdrawn to the east, and Aetius was not strong enough to pursue successfully. So ended the threat of Hunnish domination of Western Europe. But that was also the last great stand of the Roman Empire in the West. Only a few years later, in 476, the last weakling Emperor was forced to abdicate by the German leader, Odoacer. Odoacer, however, himself brought relative peace and prosperity to at least the Italian sector of the Empire as a rational and fair-minded king.

In 481 Clovis, or Chlodowech in the Frankish form, succeeded to the throne of the Franks. At this time it was common among the Germanic peoples to elect their kings from among the members of their royal family, a family that was supposed to be descended from one of their gods, usually either Woden or Thor. There was, however, more than one Frankish king at the time of Clovis' accession; there were four kings ruling over different units of the Frankish confederacy. Clovis appears to have treacherously eliminated his fellow kings, and thus became the sole monarch of the Franks. But he was not only a most unprincipled politician; he was a very able general, and

a very far-seeing and clever international manipulator or statesman.

In 493 Clovis married Clothilda, the niece of the Burgundian king, who was an orthodox Christian, in spite of the fact that most of the Burgundians were of the Arian confession. Clothilda determined to convert her husband to her faith. About 496 during a battle against the Alemanni, Clovis, as reported by Gregory of Tours, when the battle was at a critical stage, began to pray to the God of the Christians, promising to become a Christian if the victory were granted him. "Immediately," says the pious Bishop, "the Alemanni turned and fled." Clovis was so impressed that he and three thousand of his soldiers were immediately baptized.

Clovis was an astute man; he knew how to seize the psychological moment, and he was farsighted enough to see that the support of the Papal power would be of inestimable value in his plans for Frankish supremacy in the West. His judgment proved to be correct; the Franks succeeded where the Ostrogoths failed.

At the death of Clovis the kingdom was divided according to custom among his four sons, a custom which was also to be found among the Celts, and the same struggle for supreme control began again. But the expansion of the Frankish kingdom continued from the time of the death of Clovis to the end of the Merovingian dynasty - at the expense of the Visigoths, the Burgundians, the Alemanni, Bavarians and Thuringians. This meant almost continual warfare, new alliances and broken treaties.

In the North, also, there was continual conflict. The Germanic Saxons were land-hungry and furthermore sought to retain their pagan heritage against encroaching Christianity.

Clovis had established a united kingdom in 511, but this ceased at his death, and it was not until 558 that the kingdom again came under the control of one ruler. This ruler was Clotaire, who died in 561. But at his death the same old routine began again. The rulers of the Merovingian dynasty were a pretty ruthless lot. In the year 567 there appeared upon the Frankish scene two forceful women who had great influence upon Frankish affairs: Brunhilda and Fredagonda. The marriage of Siegbert, one of the Frankish kings, to Brunhilda, daughter of the Spanish Visigothic king, brought the Frankish king much honor, for the Visigothic court at Toledo was considered by the Franks as being most brilliant.

Siegbert's marriage was all the more imposing when compared with those of his brothers, especially Chilperic, who had repudiated his wife in favor of her attendant, Fredagonda. Jealous of his brother's success, Chilperic asked the Gothic king for his elder daughter, Galeswintha, and consent was readily given. Chilperic, on marrying Galeswintha, had to send Fredagonda away. One morning Galeswintha was found strangled in her bed, and a few days later Chilperic married Fredagonda. During the years that followed there was an undying hatred between Brunhilda and Fredagonda, and it is possible that this hatred is reflected in the Brunhild-Kriemhild strife in the *Nibelungenlied*.

From 561 to 613 was a period of almost constant civil war, in which Fredagonda played a major role. And it was during this period that the decadence of the Merovingian dynasty began to be most marked. This was accompanied by the increase of power in the hands of the nobles, until finally the power of the king was reduced to a nullity, and a mayor of the palace was appointed, usually from among the most powerful of the nobles, to perform all the duties of the sovereign, except that of having the title. From the year 639 on began the period of the *rois faineants*, the "sluggard kings."

Charles Martel. In 717 Charles Martel, the mayor of the palace in the eastern part of the Frankish territory, Austrasia, succeeded in establishing his position on a secure basis, and he was soon able to extend his authority over Neustria, the western part.

In 711 the Moorish Saracens had begun their invasion of Europe by moving into Spain, where, as we have seen, the Visigothic power after an ineffectual resistance collapsed. In 716 the Saracens entered Gaul, and in 720 they had captured all of the old Visigothic territory in Southern France. The Moslems gradually moved further north until they constituted a very definite threat to the continued existence of the Frankish power. Charles proceeded to take an active interest in this Moslem advance. He collected his forces and in a great battle fought on October 17th, 732 near Poitiers, the Moslem army was so severely handled that it withdrew during the night.

Dr. Sidney Green, Brookland, New York

Editor's Note: This article concludes in the next issue of H&D with part XI - The Founding of the Modern Nations of Western Europe.

England & Europe: The Smokescreen of Deceit

A discussion of the EU's usurpation of our national independence

The welcome outcome of the Irish referendum on the Lisbon Treaty focuses the spotlight on the arrogance of tyrants like José Manuel Barroso who, even before the result was announced, dictatorially demanded that the result should be ignored and not allowed to impede the "European Project". At the time of writing, I do not know what action the self-serving despots in Brussels will take or how our Government will react, though early indications are that it will support Barroso. However, it is my sincere hope, and I believe that of millions of Europeans, that the humiliation heaped on the Eurocrats by the courageous Irish people will hasten the day when we will be freed from the straitjacket in which we in Britain have languished ever since Edward Heath signed the Treaty of Accession in 1972.

During my school days our history master taught us that British governments had always sought to avoid becoming too involved with Europe, except to maintain the "Balance of Power" on the Continent, thus preventing any European state from becoming too powerful. This was seen as a sensible form of self-protection for these islands. During the past thirty-five years by contrast, owing to the folly and connivance of British politicians and their mentors, our country has been sucked into the vortex of the European maelstrom. This catastrophe has been brought about by our membership of the European Union, formerly known as the European Economic Community (EEC).

Readers will understand that discussing so vast and complex a subject as the EEC/EU within the limitations of an article is an impossible task. I shall therefore confine myself to recalling my active opposition to our entry into Europe, which began in the 1960s, and conclude by discussing some of the disastrous consequences entry has had, and is continuing to have, on our country.

My experiences were mainly gained as a member of a small group of English patriots in the West Country who, from the beginning, opposed our entry into Europe. We were not unique; there were many other small groups throughout the country who were actively campaigning against entry. Unfortunately, however, these groups, owing to a combination of our failure to coordinate efforts, our relative inexperience, the downright lies, falsehoods and prevarications of the Euro-fanatics, and our lack of funds, had no chance of making the impact necessary to warn our compatriots what EU membership would ultimately mean. It is a measure of the fundamental dishonesty and deceit to secure our entry that the European Economic Community later became the European Community and later still metamorphosed into the European Union, conveniently dropping all pretence that it was simply an economic arrangement created for our mutual benefit. From the beginning, the architects of our entry, Edward Heath and his co-conspirators, were well aware that the real aim of membership was the creation of a Federal Europe. Indeed, to anyone who took the trouble to read the Treaty of Rome, one thing was immediately clear. The main purpose of the EEC had little to do with purely economic matters so much as the creation of a centralised authoritarian body, totally devoid of democratic principles, whose ultimate aim was the creation of a European superstate. Also clear was the fact that whereas the disadvantages of entry were immediate, obvious and easily understood, the supposed advantages were highly speculative and possible only when considered in the long term. As the noted economist Lord Keynes said, "In the long term we are all dead".

We were assured by the advocates of entry that there would be no diminution of our national independence or individual freedoms; but we regarded these claims with scepticism. Even in anticipation of our eventual entry, the Government had already adopted decimalisation of our currency, had announced that we were going to adopt the metric system, had commenced the removal of deficiency payments to our farmers so as to raise food prices to levels approaching those of the six original member countries, and had announced the intention of introducing VAT. These measures were mandatory requirements if we were to secure entry.

At this point I must add that we were in no way hostile to European people; we are Europeans ourselves. Our opposition was solely against proposals that our country should be subject to rules emanating from an extraneous foreign organisation, and against those treasonable people, particularly politicians and others, who advocated such a surrender of our independence. What, in any case, was wrong with our trading arrangements and position in the world prior to our joining the EEC? We belonged to the European Free Trade Association (EFTA), the UN and NATO, were signatories of the Bretton Woods Agreement, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), and we had strong links with many other countries, especially those belonging to the White Commonwealth. Joining the EEC was bound to damage those relationships, besides damaging our own economy and being a betrayal of our kith and kin in the Commonwealth, who had supported us in two world wars. Hitherto we sold our manufactured goods to the world, and those with whom we traded sold us their raw materials and foodstuffs. It was a mutually beneficial system, and one bound to be destroyed were we foolish enough to join the EEC.

When considering the EEC/EU we must first understand that it is a purely artificial construct, unlike our inherited form of government that has evolved organically over many generations. As Spengler says, "All things organic are dying in the grip of organisation. An artificial world is permeating and poisoning the natural". The EU is such an artificial world.

My opposition to British membership of the EEC began in the 1960s, long before Prime Minister Harold Macmillan first mooted the idea of our joining. Twice, in 1963 and in 1967, President de Gaulle had given a resounding "Non!" to Macmillan's abject overtures. But despite these humiliations, Macmillan renewed his efforts until de Gaulle relented. At that time, I was serving in the RAF. I had no particular interest in politics and the little I knew about the EEC I gleaned from the newspapers, most of which were biased in favour of British entry.

One day in 1961, being at a loose end and looking for something to read, I found a copy of the Treaty of Rome in the library on the RAF station where I was then serving. I took the document back to my billet and read it from beginning to end. Its contents horrified me. Many of the Articles contained in the Treaty seemed to presage the ending of Britain as an independent nation. Two Articles stood out in particular:

Article 189: Regulations shall have a general application. *They shall be binding in every respect* and directly applicable in each Member State. (My emphasis.)

Article 240: The Treaty shall be concluded for an unlimited period. It occurred to me that if the British Government acceded to the terms set out in the Treaty, we would no longer be a free, democratic and independent nation for the foreseeable future. What does "unlimited period" mean if not *ad infinitum*? In my relative ignorance - and I was then a very apolitical young man - I could not understand how our politicians and others could fall for such a scam. Over the coming years, I was to learn that many of the proponents of membership were not concerned with the welfare of our people and country, but rather with the opportunities for big business and prospects for providing "jobs for the boys". Some advocates of entry were obviously concerned with feathering their own nests. I resolved that I would do everything in my power to oppose our entry.

Shortly after this I was posted to Germany where I had little chance to do very much; but as my new station lay only a few hundred yards from the Dutch border and about ten miles from the Belgian border, I had a good opportunity to see how the EEC, was working. During the next three years I was able to discuss the EEC with inhabitants of those three member countries, how it affected their lives and their views about it. Many of those I spoke to were as hostile towards it as I was.

On my return to England in late 1965, I was posted to the large RAF transport base at Lyneham in Wiltshire. Once there, I took every opportunity to express my



Fleet Street's satirical take on the Europhile lobby depicts PM Edward Heath and fellow crossparty Europeans including Roy Jenkins, Shirley Williams, Jeremy Thorpe and Willie Whitelaw, while a pro-European of an earlier generation (Sir Oswald Mosley) gives his blessing and a well known Brussels landmark comments on the end of British sovereignty!

opposition to our joining the EEC by writing numerous letters to local and national newspapers, journals and periodicals, and to MPs of all political persuasions. I also made a point of attending all political meetings held in the area, where I asked awkward questions alluding to the terms of the Treaty of Rome. I was surprised to discover that many of the Europhile speakers at such meetings, including Government ministers, were unable to answer my questions. Evidently, most of them had not read the Treaty they were so eager to foist upon us. Indeed, some of them, unable to answer my questions, admitted they had not read it! Recently, an arch-European, the former Tory Chancellor Kenneth Clarke, admitted that he had never read the Rome or Maastricht Treaties!

I continued this activity for three or four years. Unknown to me at that time, a group of people in the surrounding area who agreed with my views had noticed my letters published in the local press. They were mainly farmers, market gardeners and small businessmen who rightly feared that their livelihoods would suffer if we were to join the EEC. They decided to contact me. One day a Frenchman named Charles Baile de Laperriere, who lived at Hilmarton Manor near Lyneham, called at my married quarters and asked me if I would help the group to set up an anti-Common Market association in the area. He also asked me if I would be prepared to become its secretary. I declined this position because I felt it could cause conflict with my RAF bosses, but I agreed to help the group in any way I could. For reasons I never discovered, Charles was a bitter opponent of the EEC, which he told me was the reason he came to live in England.

I attended a meeting held by the group at Charles's manor house, at which we formed what we called the Chippenham Anti-Common Market Association, named after the nearest town in the area. We held regular meetings at the manor, inundated the local press with letters, and I wrote press releases informing the papers of our activities. We also hired halls in which we held public meetings in the small towns and villages round about. We made a point of attending *en masse*, public meetings held by Europhiles and pro-market organisations. Some of us became very good hecklers, much to the consternation of pro-market MPs who were unused to such recalcitrance from the peasantry. Soon we were making quite a splash and our membership rose. It was an exciting time, even a romantic time for us. We looked upon ourselves as the English Resistance!

Even so, I was rather concerned that my participation in these activities could get me into trouble with the RAF, as it is strictly *verboten* for servicemen to participate in political matters. At that time, I was within four years of qualifying for an RAF pension and did not want to jeopardise that. We then hit upon a brilliant idea. We knew that the retired RAF ace, Air Vice-Marshal Donald "Pathfinder" Bennett, an Australian, was an outspoken Eurosceptic. We thought that if we could persuade him to become our president it would be a mitigating factor if any serving member of the RAF (and there were several in our Association) got into trouble. In such a case we could then respond, "But Sir! Air Marshal Bennett is our president!" Accordingly, we wrote to Don Bennett. He not only agreed to become our president; he also came and spoke at one of our meetings. He gave an inspiring speech to a well-attended meeting in Wootton Bassett. His presence attracted the local press and we received much favourable publicity and many new members, particularly from the RAF.

Soon we became more ambitious than simply aiming our efforts at the press. We began inviting well-known opponents of EEC membership to speak at our meetings. I cannot recall the names of them all, but the speeches that stick in my mind were those made by Mr Victor Montagu, the former Earl of Sandwich, who had earlier renounced his peerage and was president of the Anti Common Market League; Mr Roger Moate, a Tory MP; Mr Geoffrey Edge, a Labour MP; Lt-Cmdr M Hart RN; Alderman R J Downham, a former Mayor of Calne; Mr S C Smith-Cox, chairman of the Grand Hotel group of companies; Col Douglas Kennedy, Founder of the British Livestock Export Federation; and Leslie Hopkins, a Fellow of the Royal Economic Society. I wrote to Enoch Powell and invited him to speak at one of our meetings. He kindly replied but regretted that he already had too many other speaking engagements.

Our meetings were attended by a wide cross-section of the local population. Despite all our successes, we still felt that we were not doing enough to make a real impact locally. A very practical-minded RAF corporal member of our Association suggested that we should use his van and tour round local villages to warn the inhabitants how joining the EEC would affect us all. He managed to borrow a loudspeaker and covered his van with anti-EEC slogans. We began touring around the locale. He did the driving and I chanted slogans. We stopped at the villages and I made impromptu speeches.

We then encountered a problem. Someone complained to the local police that we were exceeding permitted noise levels and waking up babies, even though we always ceased our activities by 7pm. However, I noticed that the chimes on ice cream vans made far more noise that we did, and were operating much later than we were. So we surreptitiously "borrowed" a decibel meter from the station Electronics Centre and did a comparative check between our loudspeaker and the chimes on the ice cream van that regularly came round our married quarters. This proved that we were much the quieter. We gave the figures to the local police and

invited them to witness a demonstration, but they did not respond. I then sent them a letter informing them that I would make an official complaint against the ice cream vendor if we were not allowed to use our loudspeaker. We heard no more about the matter and continued our activities unmolested.

After several weeks, the RAF authorities got to know about our activities and took rather a dim view of them. We thought that eventually this would happen and were prepared for it. One day my Squadron Commander called me into his office. He told me that by participating in political activities we were contravening Queen's Regulations, which he said, was a court-martial offence. My response was that the Government's proposal that we should join the EEC was not a matter of politics, but of treason. To emphasise the point, I quoted poet John Harrington's apophthegm: *Treason doth never prosper: what's the reason? Why, if it prosper, none dare call it treason.*

I further pointed out that the Heath Government's intention of signing the Treaty of Accession was simply surrendering our national sovereignty to an unelected foreign organisation, and that in former times Heath and his colleagues would have been impeached and incarcerated in the Tower! I added that I thought there was very little likelihood of my being court martialled, as such action taken against a serving airman would soon find its way into the press (and I would make sure that it did) and become a *cause célèbre*. This would have been an enormous embarrassment to the Establishment and was hardly worth the candle. In the event no action was taken against me, though my promotion prospects were probably not greatly enhanced!

Shortly after these events, I was posted to RAF Sealand, a station on the Welsh border near Chester. There I had no opportunity to participate in the activities of my friends in Wiltshire. I had to content myself with bombarding the press and various MPs, including Prime Minister Heath, with letters. A letter to Heath resulted in my receiving a nonsensical reply from Douglas Hurd who was then Heath's Political Secretary. In October 1972, I read the European Communities Act and this provided me with more ammunition to use in my letter campaign. However, time was rapidly passing and it would not be long before Heath would sign the Treaty of Accession and we would become a member state of the EEC. In desperation, I wrote a letter to the Queen, asking her to withhold the Royal Assent for the Treaty until the people had been consulted by means of a referendum. I received a reply from the Queen's Private Secretary informing me that she had instructed him to forward my letter to the Prime Minister. My efforts were completely wasted, for I received a letter from 10 Downing Street containing much the same gobbledegook as I had earlier received from Mr Hurd.

As mentioned earlier, even before we joined the EEC it was obvious to thinking people that plans were secretly afoot to meet the conditions that were a prerequisite for entry. The most obvious examples being the introduction of decimalisation on 15 February 1971, and agreements that we would introduce VAT by 10 April 1973 and metrication by 1 January 1978. All these policies fundamentally changed our way of life that had existed for almost 1,000 years.

On 22 January 1972, Heath signed the Treaty of Accession in Brussels. Even that event was a dishonest farce. Some readers may remember a photograph of Mr Heath signing the document with the chief negotiator, Geoffrey Rippon, looking on. Near them was a small table bearing a large pile of some 3,000 documents, supposedly containing corollaries to the Treaty, which were also accepted by virtue of Heath's signature. What many people did not know at the time was that many of those documents were blank because there were too few lawyers with either the language or the technical skills required to draft them. In other words, Heath signed a blank cheque! We joined the EEC on 1 January 1973.

After Heath signed the Treaty there was little more we could do, but as far as I was concerned it was a case of *causa non finita est* - the matter is not finished - and I resolved that as soon as an opportunity occurred, as I was sure it would, I would again take up cudgels against this abject surrender of our national sovereignty. That would be some three years later. In the meantime I retired from the RAF and moved with my family to Bletchley in Buckinghamshire, where I got a job. At that time I was unaware that Bletchley was soon to be subsumed into that multiracial and multicultural Tower of Babel now known as Milton Keynes. The first stage of my anti-marketeering campaigning was over; the second stage was about to begin.

During the general elections of 1974, Labour leader Harold Wilson realised that by promising to hold a referendum on our continued membership of the much hated EEC, Labour would greatly increase its chances of winning power by dangling before us the prospect of disentangling our country from the EEC. Labour won both elections. However, I was sceptical: firstly, because Wilson and Labour had been opportunistically sitting on the fence with regard to our membership for some time; secondly, because I suspected that the wording on the voting slips would be formulated in such a way that would favour a "Yes"



The 'No' campaign in the 1975 Referendum on Common Market membership was hopelessly outgunned by pro-European propaganda, though leading 'Vote No' campaigners included Barbara Castle (far left), Enoch Powell (second left), Sir Neil Marten (centre), Peter Shore, Jack Jones and Michael Foot

vote; and thirdly, because Wilson said his Government would seek to "renegotiate our terms of membership" and we would remain a member only if "the terms were right". I took all that subterfuge with a pinch of salt.

I felt sure that if Wilson were returned to power he would manipulate the referendum to ensure that we would stay in the EEC. I was proved right, for that is precisely what happened. In several polls held prior to the referendum the average results in reply to the question "If you could vote tomorrow on whether we should stay in the Common Market or leave it, how would you vote?" were: 33% to stay, 41% to leave, 26% don't know.

The result in reply to the carefully crafted question actually used at the referendum "If the Government negotiated new terms for Britain's membership of the Common Market and thought it was in Britain's interest to remain, how would you vote - to stay or to leave?" was: 53% to stay, 22% to leave, 25% don't know.

The fraudulence of the referendum was manifest. Vast sums of public money were spent by the Government on propaganda to persuade the people to vote in favour of continued membership; but similar funds and facilities were not made available to those of us who opposed continued membership. I well remember propaganda leaflets extolling the advantages of EEC membership being distributed in our local post office and library, but when we requested that our leaflets should similarly be distributed we were told that it was forbidden "on government orders"! I recently read somewhere that twenty times as much was spent by the Government and pro-EEC organisations as was spent by opponents of continued membership.

As I was new to the area and knew very few people, I operated as a loner confining myself to attending meetings, questioning speakers, asking them awkward questions that they were often unable to answer, and by writing letters to the press and articles to a variety of periodicals. Before long I was contacted by some local people opposed to EEC membership. A couple of them were members of the National Front, of which I had long been a member. Soon more than a handful joined us. They were mainly members of the Labour party, but there were also a few Conservatives. We kept quiet about our NF membership for fear that the others would refuse to work with us.

Despite our efforts and enthusiasm, the referendum went badly for us, both locally and nationally. We were hampered by a lack of funds, difficulty in hiring halls for meetings, hostility of council officials and opposition of the media - with the notable exception of *The Spectator*, which kindly published several of my letters. Nevertheless, we made friends in the most unlikely places and had some laughs. I particularly remember one afternoon our van was parked in a lay-by on the A5 and my companion and I were eating our sandwich lunch when a large car pulled up behind us. Out stepped Eric Heffer, a well-known left-wing MP. He complimented us on the standard of our slogans displayed on the van. Then he added, "You lads are doing a fine job for the Labour Party". Little did he know that we were both members of the National Front! We did not enlighten him.

The referendum was held on 6 June 1975 and we were naturally disappointed at the outcome. However, we took some comfort that the number who voted for continued membership amounted to less than 43 per cent of those entitled to vote. This made nonsense of Mr Heath's claim that he had been vindicated. The

result clearly showed that "full-hearted consent" for British membership had not been obtained. Heath's fraudulent claim was backed up by Prime Minister Wilson. We were defeated for the time being, but determined that one day we would, like the Phoenix, arise from the ashes. But for the time being the battle was over.

In 1979 a dispute arose in the National Front over whether or not the party should take part in the Euro-elections to be held that year. The two main disputants were the leader John Tyndall and Martin Webster. John was opposed to taking part, while Martin was in favour. I was utterly opposed to the NF taking part. I felt it would be hypocritical for us to do so and would make us a laughingstock. It would also deplete our meagre funds. I believe John's thinking was much the same as mine. Martin, on the other hand, with the support of his homosexual friends, favoured participation as a means of obtaining an opportunity for publicity, as well as a means of undermining John's leadership. The party's National Directorate decided to put the issue to the membership at the forthcoming AGM.

A few days before the AGM, John asked me if I would second his motion that the party should not contest the elections. I think he asked me on account

of my credentials as an anti-EEC veteran. I was rather reluctant to take on this task because as a public speaker I realised I was not in the same league as such titans as John and Martin. I expressed my concern to John. He told me just to do my best. I think the truth was that there was a dearth of anyone in the party who was much interested in the EEC and it would be useful to have someone who was, if only to answer any questions.

Seconders were allotted only five minutes to speak. What could anyone say about something as complex as the EEC in such a short time? When the time came, I spoke for two or three minutes and then, waving aloft my tattered copies of the Treaty of Rome and the European Communities Act, I recited John of Gaunt's famous speech from *King Richard II*:

England, bound in with the triumphant sea, whose rocky shore beats back the envious siege of watery Neptune, is now bound in with shame, With inky blots, and rotten parchment bonds; That England, that was wont to conquer others, Hath made a shameful conquest of itself.

(The documents in my hand represented the "rotten parchment bonds"!) There was an immediate eruption of applause that surprised me. We won the vote overwhelmingly. The homosexual nexus, which had done so much to discredit British Nationalism, was defeated.

The first European election was held on 7 June 1979. The UK was allocated 81 seats, though this was of little consequence as Members of the European Parliament had, and still have, hardly any power. Indeed, the Parliament is a toothless tiger occupied by grossly overpaid stooges. MEPs are permitted to speak for only a few minutes in any debate. Their sole exercise of power is their right to dismiss the Commission by adopting a motion of censure, providing they have at least a two-thirds majority in favour of doing so. This has happened only once, in 1999, when the entire Commission was forced to resign after the revelation of a massive case of corruption. No one was prosecuted, as commissioners are immune from prosecution for life. Those who did resign were soon able to return to their lucrative and cosy jobs. The only person to suffer was the whistleblower, who was sacked. To make matters worse, for 13 consecutive years, the European Court of Auditors has refused to sign off the EU's accounts.

In 2005, Marta Andreasen, the European Commission's chief accountant, was sacked by Neil Kinnock (the unscrupulous EU gravy-trainer) for revealing that there was a £130 million discrepancy in the accounts. She also complained that the EU's book-keeping was riddled with "slush funds and fraud".

Despite the impotence of MEPs, the EU is fond of claiming that it is the most democratic international assembly in the world because it has an elected parliament. That is a disingenuous claim for three reasons: firstly, because, as we have already seen, it is almost impossible to remove the Commission; secondly, because the Parliament cannot propose candidates to serve on the Commission; and thirdly, because all appointments to the Commission require the approval of the Commission President. The EU also claims that since its inception it has prevented wars in Europe. This is nonsense. It is the fear of nuclear warfare that inhibits European countries from fighting one another. It is also pertinent to point out that no customs union, which is what the EU mendaciously claims to be, has ever prevented war. We only have to recall the consequences of the

Hanseatic League (a contributory cause of the Thirty Years' War) and the *Rheinbund* to be aware of that.

With a set-up like that outlined above, it is hardly surprising that corruption is rife in the EU. The alleged cases of corruption by MEPs and EU officials are legion. It seems that even Peter Mandelson, who was twice forced to resign as a cabinet minister on account of his shady dealings, had little difficulty in being appointed a commissioner.

The rules and regulations promulgated by the EU encompass almost every aspect of our daily lives. Some of them are pettifogging irritations, while others are frightening in the power they confer on the unelected bureaucrats in Brussels. The most worrying are those that threaten our liberty such as those concerning the law, the police and national defence. Already EU law takes precedence over our Parliament and the laws of this country that have evolved over centuries.

Since its foundation, the European superstate has enhanced its powers by means of several "amending" treaties. The best known of these are the treaties of Maastricht 1992, Amsterdam 1997, Nice 2001, and most recently Lisbon 2007, which it seems that EU still intends member states to ratify despite its rejection in the Irish referendum. These treaties are far too detailed to be discussed here; but the detrimental effects they are having on our way of life is felt by us all. In addition they have resulted in a welter of regulations to which we are now subjected. Many of these are too well known for any need to repeat them. There is a perception that many new laws enacted are the result of decisions made by our own Government. Often, however, that is not the case. They become law after rubberstamping by our Parliament in order to comply with EU regulations. Our MPs are reluctant to acknowledge this because they do not care to admit that they no longer have any real power. Brussels gives the orders and our Parliament must do as it is told. This raises the questions: what is the purpose of Parliament and why are we paying these highly paid MPs? What is worse is that our bureaucrats do their best to apply the regulations far more stringently than originally intended by the Eurocrats. We get the worst of all worlds.

Today we are subjected to a multiplicity of new regulations, directives and rules on an almost daily basis. Many of these are just irritants, like Home Information Packs (HIPS), while the sheer absurdity of some of them is laughable. For instance, there is the bizarre rigmarole required by Council Directive 92/102/EEC, which deals with the granting of Pet Pig Walking Licences to people who keep pet pigs. It states: *"Licences can be issued to take pet pigs for walks. For a licence you need to contact your local Animal Health Divisional Office. Your route will need to be approved. If the Veterinary Officer at the Animal Health Divisional Office believes there is a risk with your route it will not be approved. Routes may not be approved due to proximity to: a livestock market, high health status pig farms or fast food outlets. If it is approved, you are issued with a licence that needs to be renewed annually. The person walking the pig must carry a copy of the licence throughout the walk."*

Or again, there is Council Directive 90/426/EEC that requires all members of the horse family (*Equidae*) to have passports! This even includes Devon and Dartmoor ponies. One wonders why this directive applies to these ponies until one remembers that the French have a propensity for eating horsemeat! Perhaps frogs and snails should also require passports.

It would require several volumes to discuss all these crazy regulations and directives, but I cannot resist mentioning an experience of my own. For a while, I worked for a manufacturing company. One of my tasks was to compile monthly details of the sales made by the company, as required by the EU. There was a problem. The column on the form supplied for recording the sales of each type of unit had no heading. The first time I used the form I was uncertain whether to enter the number or the value of sales of each type of unit sold. I therefore contacted my counterparts in companies producing similar items. Some told me they entered numbers of units while others entered values in pounds sterling. The busybodies in Brussels then aggregated these sums. Quite obviously, the results obtained were meaningless.

So what have been, or shortly will be, the results of our membership of the EU? They have been disastrous and highly damaging. Among other things, they have brought about:

The destruction of our fishing industry. As the Icelandic cod wars were to prove, our pusillanimous leaders were so desperate to secure entry into Europe at any cost that they abjectly surrendered our right to fish international waters near Iceland, which was demanded by that country. During the Second Cod War Prime Minister Heath, who regarded our fishermen expendable, gave in to the Icelanders by agreeing to allow them to extend their territorial waters to 50 miles. Unsatisfied with this concession, the Icelanders then extended their claim to 200 miles, causing the outbreak of the Third Cod War. Once again, the Government surrendered, thus greatly reducing the waters available to our fishermen. Over the years, successive governments had allowed foreign fishermen to overfish our waters, so that many species became endangered. The EU solution to this problem was to cut our fishing fleet. In addition, our six- and twelve-mile territorial limits were abolished so that EU vessels are now permitted to fish up to our shoreline. EU vessels are also allowed

to catch spawning cod in what were British waters, while British fishermen are instructed to remain in port even though their vessels are much smaller. It is even more scandalous that when permitted to fish, our fishermen are often made to throw perfectly good fish overboard to comply with EU regulations supposedly intended to "conserve stocks". Of course, Iceland was sensible enough not to join the EU. Why? Because the Icelanders realised they would lose control over their fishing grounds due to the EU's Common Fisheries Policy!

The destruction of our agriculture. One of the main reasons why General de Gaulle originally opposed Britain's membership of the EEC was to buy time to enable the Common Agricultural Policy to be formulated and implemented before Britain had any say in the matter. Once the policy was in place, he then became enthusiastic about British membership. The whole purpose of the CAP was to featherbed French peasant farmers with huge subsidies. What better way to achieve that than by getting the other member states, particularly Britain and Germany, to pay for it? That is why we were to experience the infamous butter and beef mountains and wine and milk lakes. The vast bureaucratic labyrinth of the CAP is a prime example of the systemic madness of the EU. All we have now are red tape and paper mountains.

The closure of many local abattoirs. The stringent application of criteria laid down by the directive on meat hygiene for the operation of smaller abattoirs has led to the closure of many local abattoirs. This has resulted in increasing the costs of slaughtering and transporting livestock. It has been claimed by the operators of large abattoirs, who benefit from the closures, that this has improved hygiene standards. There is no evidence to prove this.

The decline of our steel and manufacturing industries. These industries are in terminal decline as a direct result of massive subsidies to rival companies in other EU states and elsewhere. Subsidies are illegal under EU law, but some countries ignore the law while the UK rigorously enforces it. Under Single Market rules, subsidised steel and manufactures flood our markets causing widespread job losses.

An influx of immigrants from the EU. The Schengen Agreement, which removes internal border controls between member states and gives EU citizens the right to enter the UK and take up employment, has increased unemployment, lowered wages for British workers and created housing shortages in many areas of the UK. This trend has also been much exacerbated by the recent expansion of the EU.

An increase of bureaucracy and red tape. The massive increase of new legislation emanating from Brussels - it is estimated that 90 per cent of all legislation now originates in Brussels - has a profoundly detrimental effect on the British economy and imposes an unsustainable burden on small businesses, many of which are forced to close. To cater for the implementation of EU regulations and directives also requires the appointment of cohorts of bureaucrats at grossly inflated salaries both here and in Brussels, thus raising the taxes that we all have to pay.

Enforcing regionalisation. Despite some setbacks, it is still the aim of Brussels to divide Europe into regions. This is an integral part of the grand strategy to divide and rule. Devolution is another manifestation of the same strategy. If the Scots and Welsh think that the creation of their Parliaments will give them real independence in the Euroland of the future they are sadly mistaken.

Post Office closures. Although few people realise it, the closure of thousands of post offices is another example of the destruction engineered by the EU, though our politicians will never admit it. For generations the Post Office provided the most advanced and cheapest postal system in the world and was an essential service throughout the country. It also made a profit, which was used to defray public expenditure in areas other than the GPO and Royal Mail. But the EU Competition Commissioner deemed that the Post Office was a monopoly (which it was) and therefore insisted on it being opened up to competition. As we all know, since losing its monopoly status the Post Office has greatly deteriorated, with fewer collections and a loss of business provided by non-postal services such as issuing of TV licences, etc. The cost of postage has gone up and the Post Office now runs at a massive loss. Many old people and young families, who are most reliant on the Post Office, suffer as a result of the closures, especially in country areas.

The replacement of English Common Law by the European inquisitorial legal system. Perhaps the most sinister aspect of EU membership is that EU Law takes precedence over laws enacted by our own Parliament. Our fundamental rights are systematically being eroded by stages. The EU has already made plans to replace English Common Law and our ancient legal system with the Continental Inquisitorial System, *Corpus Juris*, whereby suspects are deemed guilty until proven innocent, and can be indefinitely imprisoned without the production of evidence. It will mean the end of trial by jury. The safeguards enshrined by Magna Carta in 1215 will be rendered nugatory, and *Habeas Corpus* will be abolished. These changes to our legal system will follow from the introduction of the new constitution agreed under the

terms of the Treaty of Lisbon (which our Government claims is not a constitution, to avoid having to grant us a referendum). Who can doubt that the Treaty will be ratified? Also under the terms of the Treaty, the European police force (Europol) will have power to arrest and extradite people suspected of committing acts that are not a crime in this country.

The loss of financial independence. One would have thought that British politicians might have had sense enough to learn from the humiliation resulting from our enforced withdrawal from the European Exchange Rate Mechanism on "Black Wednesday", 16 September 1992. But no, our Government is now eager for Britain to join the European Economic and Monetary Union (EMU), which will necessitate our adopting the Euro. Were we to do so, we would no longer have control over our currency and our right to set our own interest rates. Every day would be a Black Wednesday. We would also be required to hand a large part of our gold and dollar reserves to the European Central Bank. In other words, we would lose any control we have over our currency. It is axiomatic that national sovereignty inheres in the power to issue money and determine its value. Signing up to the EMU would, I predict, be catastrophic for our country. So much is the issuing of money a mark of a government's sovereignty that whenever it is surrendered that government ceases to be in charge of events, ceases to be the real ruler, ceases to be free, and becomes a puppet in the hands of a power greater than itself, which it is then forced to obey. Power resides with those who issue money, levy taxes and determine how taxes thus raised shall be spent. Since Magna Carta, that power has been the sole prerogative, first of the Sovereign, and later of Parliament. If we join the EMU that power will be lost. The EMU is a precursor of a Federal Europe and ultimately Globalisation and World Government - concepts beloved by our current crop of politicians and their Bilderberger paymasters.

No doubt, many readers will be able to add to the list given above, but I think readers will agree that it is quite enough for the time being! However, the EU's policy of self-aggrandisement is planning to arrogate even further powers to itself. It has many other nasty surprises in store for us, including the following:

Introduction of identity cards. The Government pretends that the enormously costly policy of making us all carry identity cards is part of the war against terrorism. What they do not admit is that the policy will do very little to combat terrorism but will enable governments and other agencies (e.g. the police) to monitor us all. Nor will they admit that the introduction of ID cards is necessary to comply with the express orders of Brussels.

Banning of dissent by political parties and other anti-EU organisations. Under the terms of the Nice Treaty, the EU has the power to "lay down criteria for the acceptability of political parties at European level". The Europhiles assure us that there is little likelihood of this power ever being used. We have heard that before! If that is so, why is it necessary for the EU to give itself such powers? In any case, the EU illegally boycotted Austria for including Jorg Haider's democratically elected Freedom Party in its coalition government long before the Nice Treaty came into force. Do not imagine this power was incorporated into EU law to hamper nice respectable parties like the United Kingdom Independence Party. No, its purpose is to thwart the aspirations of Nationalists, because they alone pose a real threat to the European mess of pottage.

Charging VAT on publications. As part of its plan to harmonise VAT rates across the EU, the Commission is seeking to charge VAT on newspapers, books and magazines, which are currently zero rated here. Apart from taking more money out of our pockets, this action will also cause many small publishing firms to go out of business, thus enabling the EU to control the dissemination of information.

Creation of a European Armed Force. Just before I wrote this paragraph, the BBC announced that the Polish chairman of the EU Parliament's foreign affairs committee, Jacek Saryusz-Wolski, wants the EU to develop "hard power" and spend more money to build a European army. The French have also made it known that strengthening the EU's military capability will be a key part of their policy. The BBC says the French plans includes the building of a new EU military headquarters and proposals for member states to spend 6 per cent of GDP on defence. This must not be allowed to happen, and under no circumstances should British service personnel be made to serve under EU command. Our armed forces owe their allegiance solely to the Sovereign and not to an amorphous and artificial entity like the EU.

To most people Europe is a bore, incomprehensible, and a blight on our everyday lives. So what can we, the minority who think and care about the future of our people and country do about it? The first thing is to do everything possible to thwart the ambitions and expose those in our midst who are bent upon the destruction of our country. We must never be afraid to air our views even when we are ridiculed for daring to do so. We must express our views to those with influence, such as MPs, local councillors, church leaders, and our peers at every opportunity. We can make complaints to the Parliamentary Ombudsman if we do not get satisfactory answers from our MPs. For instance, if as happens so often, EU regulations or directives are "nodded through" Parliament without debate and your MP remains mute about it, then send your complaint to the Ombudsman via your MP, or go and confront your MP at his or her monthly "surgery" and express your anger. Perhaps it will have little effect, but if thousands of constituents took such action, MPs would be bound to take some notice of the widespread discontent. We must accuse Government ministers of betrayal every time they return from EU meetings proclaiming, as they always do, that they have achieved "a good deal for Britain", when, in fact, they have

made yet another cowardly and abject surrender of our country's freedom and independence. Let us no longer be hoodwinked by the EU's smokescreen of deceit.

Although writing to national and local newspapers is a more passive form of action, its usefulness must not be underestimated. Even if letters are not published, editors, who are themselves influential, are forced to take notice if they receive them in large numbers. We should also do our best to understand the issues involved, so that we can confidently discuss them with our friends, workmates and acquaintances. Prepare questions to put to pro-European speakers or supporters in advance. Ask questions that are bound to embarrass them, such as: Why if membership of the EU is so beneficial did Greenland choose to leave the EU? Why did Switzerland, Iceland and Norway refuse to join? Why are all those countries thriving both economically and politically? Why were the Irish made to vote again after they had rejected the Treaty of Nice? Why has the rejection of the proposed EU Constitution by France and Holland in 2005 been virtually ignored by Brussels? Why are EU officials and MEPs so highly paid? Why are so many of them involved in fiddling their expenses? Why are they immune from prosecution when caught? An excellent book for those wishing to learn more about the EU, is *The Castle of Lies* written by Christopher Booker and Richard North.

The older among us should do our best to inculcate and enthuse the younger generation with the ideals and great vision of England that inspired and sustained our forefathers for centuries, and particularly during the past century when so many of them gave their lives fighting for those ideals, despite the folly of the politicians who caused the wars. Too many of our young people today are unfortunately more concerned with the pursuit of frivolous pastimes than they are with the freedom and honour of our country, and the sacrifices of those who have gone before us. I often wonder what two of my cousins who were killed in WWII would think if they could see this country today. One, a midshipman aged 20, was killed aboard HMS *Exeter*, during the Battle of the River Plate; the other, an RAF sergeant-pilot aged 19, perished with his crew over Hamburg.

There can be no question that the European nightmare has had a grave and deleterious effect on our country, has lowered our national self-confidence and undermined the morale of many of our people. But we may take comfort from the knowledge that nothing in this world is immutable. One day we shall escape the clutches of the EU if it does not self-destruct beforehand.

It is now up to the rising generation to turn their efforts to emulating our forebears by doing all in their power to fight the evil seeds of decay, destruction and despair with which membership of the EU has currently engulfed us. In so doing they will create for our descendants a legacy as worthy as that which our ancestors left us. To this end, we must stop kowtowing to the tyranny of Brussels and we must not cease to oppose and expose the traitors in our midst who are engineering the demise of our heritage and culture. Let me end by quoting the words uttered by Prime Minister William Pitt the Younger on learning of the victory at Trafalgar: "England has saved herself by her exertions, and will, as I trust, save Europe by her example".

Ronald G W Rickcord, Newport Pagnell, England



Anti-EU campaigns old and new - the National Front in 1976 and the Democracy Movement in 2001



perished with his crew over Hamburg.

There can be no question that the European nightmare has had a grave and deleterious effect on our country, has lowered our national self-confidence and undermined the morale of many of our people. But we may take comfort from the knowledge that nothing in this world is immutable. One day we shall escape the clutches of the EU if it does not self-destruct beforehand.

Heritage and Destiny

If you could visit Asgard in the twinkling of an eye
And then continue onward with that same speed to fly,
Do you think that you could ever, through all eternity,
Find out the generation where Gods began to be?

Or see the grand beginning when space did not extend?
Or view the last creation where Gods and matter end?

As each of us commits to: our struggle and our toil,
Our people learn to nurture and value blood and soil.
Improvement and expansion are one eternal round,
As we fulfill our destiny to dwell on sacred ground.
There is no end to matter; There is no end to space;
There is no end to spirit; There is no end to Race.
There is no end to virtue; There is no end to might;
There is no end to wisdom; There is no end to light.
There is no end to union; There is no end to youth;
There is no end to honour; There is no end to truth.

There is no end to glory; There is no end to love;
There is no end to being; There is no death above.

Adam Gary Clarke, Filey Yorkshire

Requiem for Omagh

Flesh may be heir to pain
but those who grieve feel still,
in disbelief, the
searing wind, the searing heat,
of Terror's blast...
see only loved ones lost
whose wounds, conceived in Hate,
shed from pierced sides
the blood of innocents
caught up in mindless Hell.
Far from Flanders' field,
whose hosts they
honoured in Remembrance,
these victims, too, fell
toppled by an unseen foe
lives stolen in a
lightning blow.

Too soon, perhaps, to
build for them a Menin Gate,
a portal grand of timeless scale
through which all who pass
will do so knowing how
Man's glaring inhumanity
has triumphed once again.
Better now, instead, to raise
a vision of expanding Trust; of
Justice holding sway; of balm
for troubled souls as, united
on the Bridge of Hope, each
strives for Peace beyond
Terror's dark abyss.

(Dedicated to J. and her fellow victims - Pax Vobiscum)

Rob MacNeil, Leeds, Yorkshire



Rick Hobbs

1960



2009

A steadfast campaigner for racial nationalism and political freedom, Yorkshireman Rick Hobbs died just before Christmas.

Rick, who had been a member of the *Spearhead* Group, the White Nationalist Party and the Nationalist Alliance, was only 49 years old and died of a sudden heart attack at his home in Ilkley, West Yorkshire. His funeral was held in West Yorkshire and was attended by both his family and comrades from across the Nationalist Movement.

Even though Rick worked under contract for government-owned companies and could have lost his job at any time if his beliefs had been discovered, he never missed a public demonstration organised by the WNP/SG, or more recently the NA or BPP. He was, over the last few months, particularly involved in the campaign to support political prisoners Simon Sheppard and Steve Whittle, by contacting newspapers in a vain attempt to get them to publicise the Heretical Two's story, visiting MPs to get them to help on their behalf and attending their trials across the country. He remained active in their support until the day of his death.

Rick will be greatly missed by all his comrades; he was a true Yorkshireman, honest and not afraid to speak his mind and a true National Socialist loyalist. He was someone I was proud to call a friend, a comrade and a brother.

Kevin Watmough, Bradford, Yorkshire

ULSTER NATION

The Journal of Ulster-Nationalism and Race

Sample copy available by sending 3 first-class stamps to:
ULSTER NATION, PO BOX 19, PORTRUSH BT56 8WG

Neither Dublin nor London

**INDEPENDENCE
FOR ULSTER!**



NO SELL-OUT - NO SURRENDER!

ULSTER NATION, PO BOX 19, PORTRUSH BT56 8WG

Imperium & Vanguard

Imperium is the quarterly journal of the BPP; and *Vanguard* is the monthly magazine of the BPP. For a sample copy of both publications, please send just £5.00 payable to BPP to; **BM Box 5581, London, WC1N 3XX**

Check out their website at - www.bpp.org.uk and subscribe to *Nationalist Week* E-News bulletin at - admin@aryanunity.com

Letters From Readers

Sir - I wish to question Peter Rushton's assertion that Hitler "foiled" a "factional manoeuvring" between Gregor Strasser and Gen. Kurt von Schleicher to have Strasser appointed vice-chancellor (*40 Years of the National Front – Part VI*) Strasser was offered the role of vice-chancellor in December 1932 but was not interested in the position. He saw himself as an intermediary between Hitler and von Schleicher and urged Hitler to support von Schleicher which Hitler refused to do. It was at this time that Strasser resigned from the Party, (a decision that left Hitler contemplating suicide) not after Hitler himself became Chancellor.

Yours faithfully,

Derek Summers, Bolton, Lancashire

Peter Rushton replies: Revolutionary parties such as the NSDAP in the 1930s (or the BNP today) often face difficult strategic decisions. I'm grateful to Derek for clarifying that Strasser resigned at the end of 1932 (a few weeks before Hitler's appointment as Chancellor) having taken the view that the political and economic crisis facing Germany at the end of 1932, and the evident failure of the establishment parties, demanded that the NSDAP should compromise with Germany's military elite - whereas Hitler believed that the party could hold out for absolute power rather than becoming junior coalition partners. There can be little doubt however that, whatever Strasser's motives, an important objective for Schleicher was to divide the NSDAP leadership - he was also hoping to split the socialist SPD by bringing right-wing union leader Theodor Leipart into government alongside Strasser.

Sir - Further to Peter Rushton's view of "witches", may I take the opportunity to explain the cultural heritage of these islands, namely the pagans. Pagans were the first faith philosophy: Druidic being Celtic and Wikka being Anglo-Saxon. They are earth-faith religions, Druids honouring the sun, and Wikka the moon. This being our cultural heritage which never died, but was re-rooted in folk lore and music, and enjoyed by thousands of Anglo-Celts maintaining our cultural identity. The Pagan Federation have a magazine, *Pagan Dawn* - www.paganfed.org - containing details of local groups, county events, moots, courses and social events, drumming circles. *White Dragon* magazine (Wikka) covers sacred landscapes, archeology, Wikka craft, book reviews, news, events and Pagan Music. Today groups of Pagans are active and network across the British Isles. Our Ancient Heritage, invisible for so long, has survived into the 21st; long may it do so.

Best Wishes,

J. Manning, Eastbourne, Sussex

Peter Rushton replies: I should emphasise that Movement News in Issue 35 quoted the comments of BNP organiser Mike Howson (as recorded on the BNP's membership database) regarding one of his party members describing himself as "a witch - potential embarrassment if active." Readers should not imagine that Mr Howson's view of Paganism is my own. While the BNP increasingly defines itself as an exclusively Christian party, my own view has always been that racial nationalism should be a "broad church" and should avoid religious sectarianism.

Editor's Note: In future, H&D will only be accepting letters from readers that are sent by email. However, in the very rare exception that you do not have a PC then we may accept a short letter (one or two paragraphs only) that is neatly typed. We would like to remind readers that both the Editor and deputy editor are volunteers and take no payment for their time spent producing the magazine. This being the case we can no longer devote valuable time to rewriting long hand-written letters that some readers have been sending in.



Sir - All the conditions necessary to balkanise the USA are falling into place: massive multi-racialism with ever more assertive ethnic minorities; a collapsing economy; political disintegration; diminishing international status; and now to crown it all, a non-entity as President. There will of course, always be very many close bonds at the personal

level between British and American people of the same racial stock; but any notion of a 'special relationship' between our respective governments vanished with Churchill's rhetoric. As a country, America is now as foreign to British people as any banana republic. It is no longer the powerhouse of the Western economies, the 'Almighty Dollar' has had its day. And its reliability as a military ally has deteriorated rapidly since the end of the Cold War and beginning of America's disastrous foreign imbroglios.

That the States have remained at all united for so long is entirely attributable to two factors: namely a predominantly Caucasian population of mostly European extraction, and a huge territory rich in natural resources; this latter giving plenty of 'elbow room' for local autonomy. The alien invasion has destroyed the country's cultural identity, undermined its institutions, plundered its welfare services and, most recently, helped to precipitate the banking collapse.

As I have elsewhere remarked, race and religion are the tectonic plates of the political landscape; so we can expect ever-increasing instability of the American constitution and frequent inter-racial strife over the coming years, exacerbated by an inept government and imploding economy. All of which makes the country's disintegration into racially-divided factions a foregone conclusion. Those divergent states with predominantly white populations will probably combine to frame a new constitution, and so there remains a possibility of re-establishing the trans-Atlantic links at some time. Meanwhile the rest of the country will probably descend rapidly into Balkan and Middle-Eastern type chaos.

Given this prospect, the British people should now seek to reinforce the racial bonds with white Americans while distancing themselves from their hopelessly corrupt and inept government. No black, Asian or Latin-American can represent the interests of white people in any capacity whatsoever. And the recent election of Obama will demonstrate that implacable fact as clearly as does the present South African regime.

The principal agents of America's decline are of course the usual suspects; decadent liberals, closet Marxists and the deeply-entrenched Jewish factions in politics, business, the mass media and academia. And there is some consolation in watching them sawing off the branch they're sitting on. I have little doubt that future historians will see the implosion of America as the renaissance of racial realism in world and domestic politics. Meanwhile, the demise of a deeply corrupt and fundamentally fraudulent banking system can only be applauded.

Wherever you are, and whatever your particular station in British, European or American society, you are in the front line of this war to end all wars. You will not be identifiable by wearing a uniform, but by the words you use, the company you keep, the goods you buy, the businesses you patronise, the things you read, the broadcasts you watch, the people you employ and promote, and the opinions you express; in fact by every choice you make. The only question is, how will you emerge from this challenge? The price of freedom remains eternal vigilance.

Yours for Race and Nation,

Frank Kimbal Johnson, Louth, Lincolnshire

Editor's note: Shortly after he sent this letter in we heard from his wife that Frank had died. Frank was a long-standing racial-nationalist writer who became a big supporter of H&D - after the demise of Spearhead. He will be sadly missed. See you in Valhalla comrade.



Sir - The most recent issue of *Heritage and Destiny* shows interest in practical steps - Eddy Morrison on White Nationalism in the 21st Century and Sidney Secular on "What we must do" and Gil Caldwell on "Lessons from the Presidential Election". They all make valid points and offer insights but none offers feasible practical steps for every reader. Here are a few:

- 1) Try to meet up with like minded people in the area you live in say once a week and start as a group performing some useful and needed work or service, especially where the police or local government are found to be wanting. For example, collect rubbish from a particular area, say a children's playground on a regular basis; travel as a group regularly unobtrusive on the same bus or train line ready to intervene if a member of the public is threatened by a gang - being prepared to help each other if trouble arises and with the aim of seeing that at the time you are known to be around, the line has become safer - that will make you a few enemies but a whole lot of friends - I suspect most of the British public would support Lucifer in person in return for getting their streets safe again!; start a service shopping for old folk in an area where they are afraid to go out on their own.
- 2) Take part in local activist groups and be the most useful, dedicated and helpful part of it.
- 3) seek to cooperate with persons when you agree with them even if you normally disagree with them or regard them as your foes.
- 4) stand up for your beliefs at work.
- 5) whatever you undertake, do so as far as possible from a position of strength.
- 6) avoid putting too much emotional, financial or any other capital into positions which are certain in the near future to be lost (classic example - National Front support in the 1960s and 1970s for White Rhodesia);
- 7) instead of supporting tiny political parties consider putting your energies into one issue pressure groups instead.

This is the way to make friends and a few more friends would be a great way to move forward. Stories abound to show how extreme Joe Public is or how in accord he is with the views of the movement, only prevented, poor chap, by his own inertia or "media brainwashing" from signing up to join the new and definitive nationalist party. Well, the way to get Joe Public to be on your side is to make him your friend, not to try to sell him a 1001 page biography of some past Leader or push obscure political leaflets into his hand and expect him to make donations to your cause the moment he has put his nose round your door.

I know that any kind of community practical politics has none of the romanticism of the "Grand Idea" and "The Movement" and "the Revolution" and "the Collapse" but the day dreaming and speculation about "what a nationalist government will do" and "waiting for the collapse of the system" tends to be a pretext for doing (as opposed to saying) nothing. People of our way of thinking tend to overestimate the political and underestimate the social. Hamas and Sinn Fein owe a large part of their success to the fact that they did not underestimate the importance of "leaking roof politics", something the Liberal Democrats in England grasp better than Nationalists.

Avoid spending a lot of time knocking those whose beliefs you share to a large extent, ditto political groups. If you don't like them, don't criticise them, ignore them. Sniping at erstwhile friends weakens the sniper and the sniped at, strengthens the ghetto mentality and reinforces the impression that opposition to the *status quo* is divided, weak and has poor prospects.

In a world governed by the success ethic, everyone shuns a loser and Joe Public is very intolerant of division, as the establishment is very well aware. Divide and rule was a key tactic of the British Empire, so they have some practice.

Criticising one another looks like weakness. Distrust those who spend more time knocking erstwhile friends than attacking the current system. Whose interests is the non stop sniper of former friends really serving? Very long "histories of the nationalist movement" and meticulous and painstaking examinations of every parish election result may interest some *H & D* readers but for 99% of the population is one big yawn and a million miles from what concerns them and further proof that people like us are at best nutty navel gazers and at worst pathological bad losers.

Ghetto mentality, sour grapes, power fantasising, a preference for big plans to modest actions, unwillingness to work with others, a preference for

gossip over practical discussion, extreme interest in party political circuses, a disdain for simple mundane social involvement, adherence to distant aims at the expense of the winnable and immediate - that's the way to stand still and stagnate. Urgently needed: persons with a grasp of the real and the realisable to move us forward by making friends, getting involved, being social, doing things better and being the people you can rely on in times of trouble. Once you and your friends are known as the people who keep an eye out for old people around the X estate or who are always cleaning up Y playground or who are the most helpful in the local environmentalist group, then Joe Public will start listening to alternative politics. He might one day want to read a history of British nationalism. Perhaps, but not any day soon. To coin Julie Andrews, "let's start at the very beginning, it's a very good place to start."

Yours sincerely
Michael Walker, Koln, Germany



Sir - I read about the Russian political analyst, Professor Igor Panarin, predicting that the USA will split into separate parts. He thinks that the West coast will go to China and the Northeast will join Europe and other parts are gobbled up by Canada and Mexico. This is nearly impossible. However it is possible that the USA will split in a different way. The Southwest could become a separate Latin American nation called Aztlan (as many Chicanos would like) or that area could join Mexico. Hawaii could become a separate nation like it was before becoming a US territory. The rest of the country is too diverse to want to belong to Europe or China. Also, both Europe and China would not want to take this land because its diversity would be a liability rather than an asset.

On the other hand the USA could see slow decline and stagnation as its culture of productivity is replaced. However, Russia could benefit if it takes the right steps. In just 20 years Russia could be the richest country on Earth if its leaders have the courage and insight to do what is right.

The United Nations Population Division predicts a bleak future for developed nations with aging populations. There will be fewer working age people supporting larger numbers of retirees. Russia is one of the few European countries which can still control its destiny. If Russia has the right policies it can attract young workers from the West. If demographic trends continue in the West and Russian leaders have the courage to take bold measures, Russia could be the only White Christian country in the world by the year 2100. It could be a beacon of hope for European people whose native lands have been overrun.

I am sure that in the future one leader somewhere in the world will have the vision to welcome European refugees seeking to live in peace among their own kind. Will it be Argentina, New Zealand, Iceland, or Russia; or will some other country take the lead? Whichever land is the first to welcome these people is destined to become the most wealthy and advanced nation on earth.

James Schneider - www.SaveEurope.net - Gaithersberg, Maryland



Sir - I appreciate and enjoy the magazine, which is full of variety. Not being an exceptional movie-goer myself, I find your reviews really interesting, often entertaining. The extended series on "The People of Northern Europe" is excellent, and various other histories by installment provide all kinds of new insights. Personally, I feel I've a long way to go before understanding what my own orientation to the wider movement for racial resurgence really is, being such a radical and bohemian by tendency. The magazine has my enthusiastic support.

Yours sincerely,
Louise King, Darlington, County Durham



Movement News Update

On January 15th the London BNP chose not to open its 2009 account, missing a by-election in Seven Sisters ward, **Haringey**, and choosing not to make political capital from the childcare scandal in the borough that had made national headlines in recent months. Their decision may have been related to the presence in the ward of part of England's largest Orthodox Jewish community in the Stamford Hill district. With the help of this Orthodox Jewish block vote, the Conservatives came close to causing an upset in what had been a Labour seat.

The following week there were two contrasting BNP performances. Michael Barnbrook (no relation of the BNP's GLA member) came within eight votes of victory in East Wickham ward, **Bexley**, close to the BNP's famous 1990s bookshop on Upper Wickham Road, Welling. Mr Barnbrook polled 790 votes (26.5%) and the Conservatives won with 26.8%, a vote share which would rarely have won an election in the past but is now increasingly common with the new political dynamic created by economic breakdown and immigration crises.

Meanwhile the other January 22nd by-election in Bentswood ward, **Mid Sussex**, saw Tony Brewer finish bottom of the poll for the BNP with 92 votes (6.6%). This ward consists of a giant council estate in Haywards Heath, the type of area where loud declarations of support for racial nationalism too rarely translate into votes.

Yet more puzzling BNP tactical decisions were evident on January 29th. London BNP again ducked out of two racial battlegrounds - the heavily Asian Valentines ward in **Redbridge**, close to the home of Nick Griffin's former chief lieutenant, failed bomber Tony Lecomber, and the very black Stoke Newington ward in **Hackney**. More surprisingly the party's **Manchester** branch also chose not to contest a by-election in Didsbury West, part of the North-West England region where Nick Griffin hopes to win a European parliamentary seat in June.

Better news for the BNP came in the North East where former National Front organiser Ken Booth finished a strong third in one of the party's main regional targets - Fenham ward, **Newcastle**. Mr Booth polled 836 votes (27.0%), but would have been disappointed to be overtaken by the Liberal Democrats, who came from third place to gain the seat from Labour.

On February 5th the BNP's most underperforming region - the West Midlands - missed a key by-election in **Wolverhampton**, but most attention was on Hyde Newton ward in **Tameside**, one of the North West BNP's main target wards. The party first contested Newton back in May 2003 when Mark Ward was Tameside's only BNP candidate yet with a skeleton campaign polled 578 votes (25.2%), and has fought each of the subsequent five contests, consistently polling around 25% or more. Last May the BNP's Nigel Byrne polled 846 votes (27.5%) cutting Labour's majority to 278. In by-election circumstances, with Labour plumbing new depths of unpopularity and a tactically squeezable Conservative vote, this looked like a winnable by-election which could kickstart Griffin's Euro-campaign, but the BNP proved unable to overcome a large scale anti-fascist mobilisation.

Labour ended up increasing its by-election majority in Newton to 490, even though the BNP vote share increased to 29.4%, with new candidate Rosalind Gauci polling 889 votes. The potentially ominous news for Nick Griffin is that for all his "modernisation" BNP support seems to have hit a plateau in wards like Newton, with too many nationalist minded Tory voters still seeing the party as beyond the pale, even in elections that are a straight fight between Labour and the BNP.

This pariah status was reinforced in a by-election on February 12th in Waddon ward, **Croydon**. Here Griffin-sceptic Bob Gertner had been sacked as organiser and replaced by the inexperienced Charlotte Lewis, seen as more loyal to the leadership and thus favoured despite one obvious liability on her CV. This predictably emerged to damage the party during

the campaign, when it was revealed that the BNP's Ms Lewis had served a prison sentence for animal rights terrorism. The media's outraged reaction was shared by many nationalists, especially those who remembered that like-minded terrorists once sent a bomb to the BNP bookshop which hospitalised party stalwart Alf Waite.

Tess Culnane returned to the BNP fold, despite regular pungent criticisms of Nick Griffin, for a by-election in Downham ward, **Lewisham**, on February 19th. This was a double by-election, though Mrs Culnane was the sole BNP candidate. Sadly the demographic change which has transformed Downham in recent years means that the ward no longer seems winnable for nationalists. Mrs Culnane polled 287 votes (10.6%), roughly half of her vote share in Downham in 2002. To make matters worse, one of the victorious Liberal Democrats was Duwayne Brooks, the famous friend of the canonised Stephen Lawrence.

In Bilton ward, **Harrogate**, BNP candidate Steven Gill finished third with 164 votes (9.2%), a small increase on the party's 6.2% in the ward in 2007. Meanwhile in Thringstone ward, **NW Leicestershire**, one of the BNP's strongest branches polled a very encouraging 465 votes (28.1%). Roy Harban and his campaign team will have been pleased with this strong third place showing, though the fact remains that the Conservatives are still positioned to frustrate BNP ambitions in the Euros.

The big news of the night however was a second BNP victory in the space of three months, with Paul Golding taking 408 votes (41.8%) for a majority of 86 votes over Labour in the London overspill estate of Swanley ward, **Sevenoaks**. The new Cllr Golding, the party's first elected representative in South East England outside London, is re-emerging as a major force in the party, which will provoke the usual jealousies and rivalries which regularly flare up in Nick Griffin's circle of personal favourites. Paul Golding was a leading young activist in the party during the first years of Nick Griffin's leadership, but left five years ago after a series of rows inflamed by his perceived closeness to the party leader. After several years working in the semi-underground rave music scene, Golding returned to the BNP in 2008 and is now a rival to Mark Collett for the chairman's ear and the party's printing and leaflet design franchises.

On February 26th the West Midlands BNP again let the side down, failing to find a candidate for **Walsall's** Rushall & Shelfield ward. Their East Midlands counterparts took up the challenge of a by-election in Greaseley, Giltbrook & Newthorpe ward, **Broxtowe**, close to the ward held by former BNP Advisory Council member Sadie Graham.

The fallout from Sadie Graham's expulsion may have contributed to a disappointing BNP result: Wayne Shelbourn polled 301 votes (13.1%), down from the 396 votes (17.0%) achieved in 2007. UKIP confirmed their growing status as a joke party by finishing bottom of the poll with 31 votes.

Though some regions mystifyingly continue to miss out on gilt-edged opportunities, the BNP managed on March 5th to contest four by-elections in one day (as they had on February 19th). Two of these were in one of the party's most efficient branches, **Carlisle**. In Castle ward there were serious suggestions (boosted by articles in the national press) that the BNP could win, but in the event Alistair Barbour finished in third place with 255 votes (19.7%), more than two hundred votes behind the Liberal Democrat winner. Meanwhile in the safe Conservative Belah ward the BNP's Tony Carvell finished fourth with 142 votes (9.4%). Though the BNP were never going to win in Belah, the branch will have been disappointed given that the BNP and English Democrats polled 96 votes each in the ward in 2007, while the English Democrats took 176 votes in 2008.


In Atherstone Central ward, **North Warwickshire**, West Midlands BNP finally managed to field a candidate. Matthew Mason polled 186 votes (21.6%), finishing a good third, but the practical effect was to allow Labour to gain a Conservative seat.

Perhaps the night's most interesting result was in Ravenscliffe ward, **Newcastle-under-Lyme**, where the BNP was hoping to build on its



Faces of modern nationalism - Paul Golding (above) won the BNP's first ever council seat in the South East region; Tony Ward (below) was attacked with a hammer as a party event in North West England descended into chaos





Bishop Richard Williamson (centre) may yet face extradition to Germany. Veteran London BNP member Richard Edmonds (right) was at Heathrow for the Bishop's return

remarkable run of success in neighbouring Stoke-on-Trent. As with numerous Stoke contests, this resulted in an even spread of votes, with the Conservatives eventually holding on to the seat by a majority of just 16 votes. The BNP's Sarah Barnes, perhaps helped by a developing corruption scandal in Stoke which has implicated senior Conservative and Labour councillors, finished an impressive third with 180 votes (20.0%), while the winning Conservative, 19-year-old Stephen Blair, was elected with just 25.4%.

On March 12th the limitations of the BNP's North West bandwagon were illustrated in two **St Helens** by-elections. In the very working class Parr ward the BNP's Paul Telford polled 183 votes (10.4%), while in the more affluent Rainhill ward Eric Swindells saw the BNP vote decline from 299 votes (8.9%) last May to 215 votes (6.3%).

A phenomenon likely to count heavily against the BNP in June is the marked difference in turnout between Parr (20.1%) and Rainhill (38.2%). If (as I expect) the weaker areas for the BNP tend to have much higher turnouts than their stronger areas, this could help prevent Nick Griffin's election. On March 19th the BNP contested Pendlebury ward, Salford, for the third time, having obtained 13.6% in 2007 and 13.3% in 2008. The party's by-election vote remained remarkably flat at 13.5% - further evidence that in much of the North West region the party has hit a plateau, failing to register further advances, and that the lucrative prize of a European parliamentary seat may elude Nick Griffin's grasp. Meanwhile the party failed to find candidates for by-elections in the London Borough of Waltham Forest and for Leek East ward in Staffordshire Moorlands.

Stranger still, there were no BNP candidate in either of two Redditch by-elections on 26th March, nor in Wolverhampton, nor in the Royal Docks ward of Newham, one of the whiter wards in the borough, where the BNP finished third at last year's GLA election. The BNP did contest two by-elections that day, making little impact in either. In the rural Leicestershire ward Long Clawson & Stathern, Melton, Lawrence Perkins finished third with 120 votes (13.1%), while Steve Fyfe in Yarborough ward, North East Lincolnshire, was fourth with 370 votes (17.4%). The Conservatives held on to a strong second place in the latter ward, where they barely existed a few years ago, and perhaps the night's most significant result was in Newham, where the Tories almost took Royal Docks ward from Labour. Suggesting that David Cameron's party will make advances in some unexpected areas at the Euro-election.

Nationalists who imagined that the days of serious anti-fascist violence were behind us will have been disillusioned by the vicious attack on BNP activists in Leigh, Lancashire, on March 13th. A campaign event addressed by Nick Griffin had been abandoned after the party lost a previously booked venue. Several Merseyside members including branch organiser Tony Ward were then attacked by hammer wielding thugs.

Mr Ward has made many enemies among radical nationalists, since he has been an outspoken supporter of Israel and is married to a Chinese woman. Neither his private life nor his pro-Zionist political position saved him from a battering at the hands of anti-fascists. Veteran BNP spokesman Dave Jones commented:

"A group of about 25 to 40 turned up armed with various weapons, bats, knives, and attacked about half a dozen of our people. They had obviously gone there to disrupt the meeting and attack people."

Former BNP activist Simon Sheppard and his Heretical Press colleague Steve Whittle are continuing their legal battle in California, where they are claiming political asylum having fled the U.K. after their precedent-setting conviction at Leeds Crown Court under the infamous race laws.

U.S. Immigration Judge Rose Peters is hearing their asylum appeal, and the London barrister Adrian Davies has crossed the Atlantic to give evidence in their defence. The Heretical Two, as they have been dubbed, were brought into court in handcuffs and leg irons (which, they confirmed, is standard procedure when asylum seekers are held in detention pending the hearing of their case, and not victimisation of themselves). They presented their own cases, as their attorney Bruce Leichty had withdrawn from the case by leave of the Court, over funding issues that he had received from friends of Simon and Steve. The U. S. government was represented by its attorney, Miss Myers.

The Court heard evidence from Simon and Steve about their experiences at the hands of the British police and Crown Prosecution Service. Their English counsel, Adrian Davies, gave evidence about the relevant provisions of English law (the Public Order Act 1986, as amended) and the English Court's assertion of jurisdiction over web pages hosted on a server located in Torrance, California.

The hearing was conducted in a very fair, courteous and thorough manner, though inevitably Simon and Steve were at some disadvantage, because they are not lawyers, and are more over being held in prison, where they have had very limited facilities to prepare for the hearing.

The Court resumed on 24th March, when Simon, Steve and Miss Myers made their concluding arguments. At the conclusion of the argument, Judge Peters reserved judgment, which she will hand down in writing in due course, probably some time in April. Since the case of the Heretical Two involves unusual questions of fact and law and more documentary evidence than is usual in asylum hearings, the judge's decision to reserve her judgment was not surprising. In the meanwhile, Messrs Sheppard and Whittle will remain in administrative detention at Santa Ana jail.

Following their stunning defeat in the London courts at the hands of Dr Fredrick Töben's expert legal team, the German authorities have a difficult decision to make in another case which challenges their debate-denying laws restricting the expression of historical opinions. The English traditionalist Catholic Bishop Richard Williamson returned to London on 25th February after being expelled from Argentina, following the worldwide media attention given to his broadcast statement: "I believe that there were no gas chambers" used in mass murder of European Jews.


Germany's socialist Justice Minister Brigitte Zypries indicated that a European Arrest Warrant could be issued to extradite the bishop to Germany, where Holocaust revisionists face five year prison sentences. German prosecutors however suggested that a European warrant was unlikely, given their inability to secure Dr Töben's extradition last November. Meanwhile the European Justice Commissioner Jacques Barrot felt able to pontificate on the bishop's case, even though Barrot himself has received a suspended prison sentence in a fraud case involving the misappropriation of state funds by a political party in his native France.

In case our readers were in any doubt about the scale of the immigration disaster facing Britain, official government projections released this month showed that over the twenty-five years from 2006 to 2031 immigration will account for 99,000 extra households every year, or one every six minutes.

Already in 1961 4.5% of UK residents had been born outside the country, though of course many of these were of British stock and returning to the motherland from various colonies and dominions. The latest figures available for 2008 showed that 11% of our population were born abroad. Other statistics suggest that as a result of higher birth rates the Asian population will rise to over 15% in London and over 10% in the West Midlands by 2020.

Rescuing racial and national identity in such a climate will require more than fatuous posturing. The BNP leadership harks back to the images of discredited 1940s politicians whose policies formed the core of the problem. Michael Walker (on page 21) offers some alternative strategies for building our movement. In the next *H&D* we will examine the post-electoral landscape and explore further responses to life amid the ruins of the Western political and economic model.

Peter Rushton, Manchester, England



Movie Review - *Valkyrie*

Released UK - January 2009; Produced by Christopher McQuarrie; Distributed by MGM; director Bryan Singer; running time 120 minutes; Rated 12A

After a long take off, *Valkyrie* finally takes flight as a thriller worth watching in its second half but still never soars very high. Thankfully, I only had to pop down to my local Odeon cinema in Preston's docklands - accompanied by a couple of comrades from Woden's Folk - to watch Bryan Singer's long-awaited account of the near-miss assassination of Adolf Hitler. Usually I have to hop on a bus or train to Manchester or even Wigan to see my favorite movies on the big screen, but not for *Valkyrie* I'm pleased to say.

For those readers who don't know the story, *Valkyrie* is about a ring of rebel German army officers, who on July 20, 1944, try and bump off AH. The movie has visual splendour galore, but is really a cold work lacking in the requisite tension and suspense. This second production from Tom Cruise and Paula Wagner at United Artists will do better than the first, *Lions for Lambs*, but is a decidedly odd choice for Christmas Day release (Stateside that is - we had to wait till January!), and looks destined for just so-so commercial returns.

Cruise himself is a bit stiff but still adequate as Col. Claus von Stauffenberg, the handsome, aristocratic officer whose disenchantment with National Socialism, AH and the war in general finds sympathetic ears among a sizeable number of military bigwigs at a time when the tide has turned against Germany in the East and an Allied invasion is expected imminently in the West.

A well-carpentered script by Christopher McQuarrie, reuniting with Singer for the first time since their joint career breakthrough on *The Usual Suspects*, and Nathan Alexander must inevitably wrestle with the *Day of the Jackal* issue of the known failure of the central plot. Allowing for the need to compress and streamline events, the scribes have hewed pretty closely to the facts but haven't injected sufficient sizzle into the dialogue or individuality into the characters.

As if the filmmakers felt the need to placate modern viewers who might wonder why they should emotionally indulge NS authority figures, the opening is swathed in Stauffenberg's feelings about how Hitler and the SS are a "stain" on the German army and his coincidentally contemporary desire for a "change" in the country's leadership. Shortly after entering these sentiments into his diary while serving in Tunisia in 1943, Stauffenberg is badly injured and loses his right arm, the last two fingers of his left hand and his left eye. Even with a black eye patch, he still looks quite dashing - while executing a Roman salute with a prosthetic arm might appear rather irreverent!

Slowly letting his insurrectionist sympathies show, Stauffenberg is introduced to a circle of powerful men, many of them old-school army officers whose conservative notions are closer to those of the Kaiser of their youth than to the NS ideology of Hitler and the SS. The script unfortunately erases many of the interesting personal and political nuances pertaining to these men, notably the urgent belief of some that, with Hitler gone, they could join with the United States and Britain to beat back the Soviet Union and prevent the Bolshevization of Germany.

What is perhaps most amazing about the plot is that so many people were involved and yet it was never detected with any certainty. Among the central figures: Major-Gen. Henning von Tresckow (Kenneth Branagh), first seen trying to kill Hitler by sneaking a bomb onto the Führer's plane; retired Gen. Ludwig Beck (Terence Stamp), a long-time Hitler opponent at the centre of the military-civilian conspiracy; Gen. Friedrich Olbricht (Bill Nighy), another veteran 'anti-Nazi', but still in a position of authority; Gen. Erich Fellgiebel (Eddie Izzard), whose role in charge of communications at Hitler's Wolf's Lair compound in East Prussia would be crucial to the plot's chances; and the most equivocal figure, Gen. Friedrich Fromm (Tom Wilkinson), commander in chief of the reserve army in Berlin, and a cagey operator who artfully turns a blind eye to the conspirators' activities while remaining cautiously loyal to the Reich.

As it finally takes shape, the plan hinges not just on eliminating AH but on implementing a coup in Berlin. To this end, Stauffenberg has the brilliant idea of turning Operation Valkyrie, the code name for a measure enabling the reserve army to take control of Berlin in a national emergency, to their own purposes.

Stauffenberg, thanks to his access, will place a bomb in a briefcase underneath the large conference table during a briefing at Wolf's Lair, while his associates in the capital will implement the government takeover as Stauffenberg flies back to Berlin.

An ambitious plan, to be certain, but one in which details large and small go wrong. Putting it on the screen in a clean, classically derived style, Singer is careful to make sure everything is clear to the viewer and emphasizes the sometimes daunting physical reality of things, such as the difficulty Stauffenberg, with only three fingers, has in cutting the thick metal wire necessary to set the bomb's fuse.

Once Stauffenberg has set off the explosion and cleverly slips away, convinced Hitler couldn't possibly have survived, the picture's grip strengthens somewhat as the coup, initially delayed, ultimately stumbles forward. Due to interrupted lines, no one in Berlin knows if Hitler is alive or dead, and the movie's single haunting scene shows a room full of female communications operators slowly raising their hands, one by one, to indicate to their supervisor that they have received some news - the Führer is dead.

It isn't long before evidence to the contrary comes through. The reserve army, which has rounded up the SS and gone to arrest Goebbels, is told to stand down, and the tables are turned on the conspirators after a few heady hours.

Story's fascination, ironies, missed opportunities, implications and what-if aspects invest *Valkyrie* with automatic appeal for anyone interested in history in general and World War II in particular. But a nagging feeling persists throughout that the movie should be more gripping than it is, and that the men involved could have been revealed with more complexity and dimension.

Cruise makes Stauffenberg a stalwart, flawed and honourable man, but reveals little sense of his stellar intellectual, artistic and family background. The star's neutral American accent contrasts with the British voices that surround him but, truth be told, it is more the Anglo intonations coming out of the German characters that sound oddly disconcerting.

Of the character actors, Wilkinson most impresses with his robust presentation of an intriguingly Janus-like figure. David Bamber carries off a pretty plausible portrait of the declining Hitler in a handful of scenes (in one scene while talking with Stauffenberg, Hitler explains to him "to understand National Socialism, you need to understand Wagner first").

Standout elements are the locations and the superb production design by Lilly Kilvert and Patrick Lumb, which convey a palpable sense of legendary historical sites such as the War Ministry, Wolf's Lair, Hitler's Berghof residence and the Bendlerblock (the executions of Stauffenberg and others were carried out at the actual spot). A couple of Junkers three-engine planes of the sort used by Hitler are impressively employed, and attention to detail is felt down the line. Newton Thomas Sigel's lensing has a restrained elegance, and John Ottman once again doubles adroitly as editor and composer.

The conspiracy to kill AH has inspired at least four previous pictures: two German productions of the mid-1950s, the 1990 American TV-movie *The Plot to Kill Hitler*, which starred the late Brad Davis as Stauffenberg, and the widely praised 2004 German TV production *Stauffenberg*, with Sebastian Koch in the title role. I've not seen any of these so I can't really compare them to *Valkyrie*. But if I were a gambling man I would bet that *Valkyrie* would come out on top.

I enjoyed the movie, as did my Woden's Folk comrades and we retired to a local watering hole to discuss it over a couple of pints. We concluded that from what we knew of Third Reich history, the movie was pretty factual - apart from the scenes of the rebels' attempted take over of Berlin - which in reality never got that far.

"But could it happen here?" asked one of my comrades, as I was finishing off a very good pint of John Smith's finest. I pondered over his question for a moment. "Well if it does we must not make the same mistake as Stauffenberg did" I replied. "What do you mean" he asked. So I explained to him, "Well if we are to ask Collett to take the suitcase into the next AC meeting in Welshpool, we must make sure he stays in the room with it, right until the end, if you know what I mean. Just to make sure you know, better safe than sorry, as I don't fancy ending up on one of those old rusty meat hooks!" The leader is dead - long live the leader!

Reviewed by, Mark Cotterill, Preston, Lancashire

